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Introduction

The charitable and nonprofit sector in Canada has a remarkable story to tell.

In addition to contributing to the fabric of society we are a significant economic force and our organizations have played a pivotal role in building and defining our nation. The sector reflects Canadians’ values and helps to implement shared visions. Yet we have not always been successful in sharing this story with Canadians.

As the next step in our National Engagement Strategy, Imagine Canada is working with a broad cross section of organizations to create a new narrative about our role and contributions. The narrative will be foundational — consistent messaging that is relevant and adaptable to all our subsectors. A new narrative is also about finding ways to attract talent (paid staff and highly-skilled volunteers) and financial resources to serve Canadians in communities here and around the world.
Together these issues paint a picture of a sector that is not well understood.
Background

One of the key goals of Imagine Canada’s National Engagement Strategy is to strengthen the collective voice of charities and nonprofits in Canada and facilitate their ability to take collective action on important cross-cutting issues. With this in mind, several years ago Imagine Canada, in partnership with local organizations, went coast to coast speaking with more than a thousand charities and nonprofits.

These community consultations provided a wealth of information and helped to identify a number of widely shared concerns. Four of these sector-wide issues became the priority areas of the November 2011 National Summit for the Charitable and Nonprofit Sector:

• solidifying the financing of charities and nonprofits;
• attracting and retaining the best and the brightest to work in our sector;
• strengthening volunteering; and,
• finding new ways to talk to Canadians about our contributions to society and the economy.

It became evident during our discussions that the fourth point above — this new conversation with Canadians about our sector — was pivotal to the success of everything else we wish to accomplish.

A number of events have highlighted the urgent need for this work:
• Bill C-470 which would have capped salaries for those in the charitable sector;
• questioning by government and some in the media about the right of charitable organizations to participate in the public policy process;
• criticism of the pace of international development efforts; and,
• media and public interest in overhead expenses and fundraising costs giving rise to rankings and ratings — often based on the wrong metrics — of charitable organizations.

Together these issues paint a picture of a sector that is not well understood.
In the fall of 2012, Imagine Canada sent out a call for sector members to help shape this initiative resulting in the creation of a 30-member steering committee with broad representation of sub-sectors and geography. This resource, the first major work of the committee, will serve as a core resource for the key messages and other tools that will be crucial in sharing this narrative with Canadians. Although primarily a resource for those in our sector, we are pleased to share this with all Canadians who would like to learn more about charities and nonprofits.
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Canadian charities and nonprofit organizations impact every facet of our lives and enjoy wide support and trust among Canadians.
Size

Canadian charities and nonprofit organizations impact every facet of our lives and enjoy wide support and trust among Canadians.

By the numbers:

- In relative terms, Canada’s charitable and nonprofit sector is the second largest in the world.\(^1\)

- There are an estimated 170,000 charities and nonprofits in Canada — roughly split evenly between registered charities and nonprofit organizations. There are different rules governing these two categories of organizations: one significant distinction is that charities are able to issue tax receipts for donations.\(^2\)

- The sector generates $176 billion in income, employs two million people and accounts for more than 8% of Canada’s GDP.\(^2\)

- More than 13 million people, just under half of all Canadians 15 and over, volunteer annually — devoting two billion hours or the equivalent of just over one million full-time jobs.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) The Canadian Non-profit and Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective, Imagine Canada, 2005.

\(^2\) 2012 Annual Report, Imagine Canada.

\(^3\) Volunteering in Canada, Statistics Canada, 2012.

---

Sector composition and economic contribution

Sources

2012 Annual Report, Imagine Canada
TOTAL INCOME FOR THE CHARITABLE AND NONPROFIT SECTOR
176 billion dollars

CANADIANS EMPLOYED IN THE CHARITABLE AND NONPROFIT SECTOR
2 million

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CHARITIES AND NONPROFITS IN THE SECTOR
170 thousand

PERCENTAGE OF CHARITABLE AND NONPROFIT SECTOR’S CONTRIBUTION TO CANADIAN GDP
8.1 percent

Sources: 2012 Annual Report, Imagine Canada
“In 2006, the latest year for which GDP by industry for Canada is available, the core nonprofit sector generated 20% more value added than the entire accommodation and food services industry, more than 2.5 times that of agriculture, and generated nearly six times as much value added as the motor vehicle manufacturing industry. The broader nonprofit sector, which includes hospitals, universities and colleges, exceeded by more than one third the value added of the entire retail trade industry.”


Gross domestic product: Charitable and nonprofit sector and selected industries, 2008

Sources
Nonprofit figures are from 2010 Satellite Accounts and CANSIM table 379-0023

NOTE
Figures are in millions.
Core nonprofit sector refers to the charitable sector excluding hospitals, universities and colleges.
Breadth of the Sector’s Work

As impressive as the numbers may be, they don’t begin to tell the whole story of the breadth and reach of our work.

When talking with Canadians about charities and nonprofits, the conversation often focuses on social service agencies and efforts to help people overcome a disadvantage or to alleviate suffering. As necessary and vital as this work is, it is by no means a complete picture of the sector.

Quoting from a Canadian Council on Social Development report, “Nonprofit organizations are a vital part of every Canadian community. They provide a wide range of essential services and programs that touch virtually all aspects of our society: social justice, safety, human rights, environment, health, sports, faith, arts and culture. Families and communities rely on nonprofit organizations in a host of ways, from welcoming newcomers, to running theatres, to organizing local hockey leagues, to protecting our wildlife and natural habitat. Through nonprofit organizations, Canadians build social capital; generate solutions to economic, social, environmental and cultural challenges; and forge the connections between citizens, communities and governments that serve as the basis of good government. Canada has one of the largest nonprofit sectors in the world. Since the late 19th century, Canadians have turned to nonprofit organizations to address community needs and interests. In past decades, Canadian governments have increasingly partnered with nonprofit organizations to build Canada’s social safety net; to promote social justice, inclusion and human rights; to foster cultural expression; to protect Canada’s environment; and to extend assistance to the international community.”

Types of Organizations

Source: National Survey of Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, 2003
## Types of organizations that Canadians support (donor rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and research</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and recreation</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granting, fundraising and voluntarism</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, advocacy and politics</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and housing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities and colleges</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, professional associations and unions</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**
### Types of organizations that Canadians support (percentage of donation value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granting, fundraising and voluntarism</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and research</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and recreation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, advocacy and politics</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities and colleges</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and housing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, professional associations and unions</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

“Just under half of organizations employ paid staff but these organizations provide over two million jobs. Employment is concentrated among a small number of organizations: hospitals, social services, and universities and colleges provide half of all employment. The bulk of employment is permanent, and a significant proportion of employees work part time.”

Volunteers

According to Statistics Canada, more than 13 million people, just under half of all Canadians 15 and over, volunteered in 2010 — devoting two billion hours or the equivalent of just over one million full time jobs. “They provided leadership on boards and committees; canvassed for funds; provided advice, counselling or mentoring; visited seniors; prepared and delivered food; served as volunteer drivers; advocated for social causes; coached children and youth. In short, they shaped their communities and enabled nonprofit organizations to deliver programs and services to millions of their fellow Canadians.” 7 Sports, social services and religious organizations jointly account for just over half the total of volunteer hours.

Sources of Revenue

Canadian charities rely on many sources of revenue and the amount of government support varies widely by type of organization.

It may surprise some people to learn that earned income is a significant and growing component of charitable and nonprofit revenue. “The range of specific earned income-generating activities is extremely broad (ranging from charging membership fees to providing consulting services and beyond) and most charities that generate earned income engage in more than one specific activity (2.7 on average).”

![Diagram showing the sources of revenue for Canadian charities.](Image)

**Source**
Barriers to earned income

In its document, Primer: Earned Income for Nonprofit Organizations, Imagine Canada notes, “Despite interest, many charities and nonprofits struggle to integrate earned income activities into their operations without an enabling and supportive environment. In a recent study, over 50% of nonprofit organizations in Ontario indicated that the current legal and regulatory environment was a barrier to engaging in social enterprise activities.⁹ There are also challenges for those seeking supports: according to the same study, 45% of all charities and nonprofits report that lack of business development support for social enterprises is a very important barrier to social enterprise activity.”¹⁰

¹⁰ Ibid.
Canadians’ Views about the Sector

In 2013, the Muttart Foundation released the fifth edition of its *Talking About Charities* survey. More than 3,800 Canadians participated in telephone interviews with data analysis provided by Imagine Canada.

Quoting from the Foundation’s news release, “Overall, almost four in five Canadians said that they have a lot or some trust in charities, numbers that are consistent over the previous four editions, released in 2000, 2004, 2006 and 2008. The 79% trust figure far exceeds the trust levels given to the federal government (45%), provincial governments (44%) and local governments (57%), as well as media (53%) and major corporations (41%). Only small businesses received a higher trust level at 81%.

“Some types of charities are trusted more than others, the study shows. Hospitals (86% trust level) and children’s charities (82%) topped the list, while environmental charities (67%), arts organizations (60%), churches and other places of worship (59%) and international development organizations (50%) scored significantly below the overall level of trust in charities.”

The study also shows:

- Charities are considered important by 93% of the population and 88% of Canadians believe charities generally improve our quality of life.
- While about two-thirds of Canadians believe charities understand their needs better than government, and are better at meeting those needs, the percentage of Canadians holding those views has declined about seven percentage points over the last five years.
- The percentage of Canadians who believe that charities are generally honest about how they use donations is still high at 70%, but has decreased from the 84% who felt that way in 2000. Similarly, only about one-third of Canadians (34%) believe charities only ask for money when they really need it, compared to 47% of Canadians who felt that way in 2000.
- Canadians continue to give charities low ratings for the degree to which they report on how donations are used, the impact of programs and charities’ fundraising costs. More detailed information can be found at The Muttart Foundation’s website.

In June 2012, the Association of Fundraising Professionals released its survey *What Canadian Donors Want*. 

---

rationale
Many donors are becoming more discerning as they want to be assured that their donation is achieving its maximum impact.
Transparency and Accountability

Many donors are becoming more discerning as they want to be assured that their donation is achieving its maximum impact.

Overall, they want to know more details about the organizations they support, which is a positive development.

Imagine Canada strongly believes that all organizations in the sector should operate with transparency and accountability. Charities already adhere to the reporting requirements established by the Canada Revenue Agency, the federal regulator of charities. These rules create a balance between privacy and transparency for Canadians. This information is publicly accessible on the CRA website and is available on Imagine Canada’s CharityFocus website.

What does this mean for the charitable and nonprofit sector?

Organizations must be proactive in demonstrating that they operate transparently and are publicly accountable. As a sector, we need to do a better job at educating Canadians about not only the value of our work but the realistic costs associated with our often complex and varied organizations’ programs and services.

What information is available from CRA about a charity?

The T3010 requires the provision of a substantial amount of information, including:

- contact information, including a contact name;
- details about directors;
- detailed revenue and expenditure information;
- description of charitable programs;
- political activities;
- transfers to qualified organizations; and,
- fundraising revenues and expenditures.

What mechanisms are in place to provide transparency and accountability?

Canadian charities are required to publicly account for their organizational activities and finances, including information about fundraising costs and staff compensation. The Canada Revenue Agency requires all registered charities to complete a Form T3010 annually. The completed form must be submitted within six months of the end of a charity’s fiscal year.
Charities must also report compensation information on Schedule 3 of the T3010 which includes the total number of full-time staff, total amount of staff compensation and the total amount paid to part-time staff. As well, for the charity’s ten highest-compensated employees, charities must report the number of employees that fall within each compensation range as defined by CRA.

**How often must charities report to CRA and what is the penalty if they do not?**

Failure to submit required T3010 information within six months of the end of the fiscal year can result in the revocation of charitable status. (For the sake of comparison, in the United States a charity can fail to file for three years before revocation of status is possible.)

**What are charities themselves doing to show that they are transparent and accountable?**

Charities rely on the trust and goodwill of Canadians and it is in their interest to be transparent and accountable. Many charities make their full financial information, audited statements, and annual reports available online. Others make that information available to donors who inquire.

There are a number of codes governing behaviour in the sector, such as Imagine Canada’s [Ethical Code Program](https://www.imaginecraft.net/ethical-code) and the Association of Fundraising Professionals’ [Code of Ethical Principles and Standards](https://www.aafp.org/~/media/files/policy/codes_of_ethics/afp_code_of_ethical_principles_and_standards.pdf). Many organizations require accreditation and are subject to ongoing inspection, such as health care or seniors’ facilities.

Imagine Canada has launched two new initiatives — the [Standards Program](https://www.imaginecraft.net/standards-program) and [CharityFocus](https) — to provide greater transparency and accountability. The Standards Program invites charities to undergo a strict peer review process to ensure that they meet minimum standards in areas such as board governance, financial accountability and transparency, fundraising, staff management and volunteer involvement.

CharityFocus was developed with assistance from the Canada Revenue Agency. It provides one-stop shopping to donors and interested Canadians who are able to find detailed information about any charity. This web portal incorporates CRA data on the charity in question and provides a place for the charity itself to upload content — financial statements, annual reports, impact statements, and videos — to better tell its story to donors.
In addition to these actions undertaken by the sector itself, staff employed by charities — such as lawyers, accountants, social workers, engineers, and medical professionals — may be governed by professional bodies that establish and enforce qualifications, standards, and ethical codes. In other cases, charitable facilities such as nursing homes or children's agencies are licensed and inspected by the relevant provincial authorities.
Overhead and Expenses

The cost of doing business is a much discussed and often misunderstood issue for the charitable and nonprofit sector.

Canadians have specific and often unrealistic expectations about how much charities need to spend to be effective.

When Canadians are asked about barriers to giving to charity, more than 30% say that they did not think the money would be used efficiently. A recent survey conducted on behalf of World Vision Canada found that 51% of Canadians believed that between 81% and 99% of money should go 'to the cause' and that 32% of those surveyed actually believe the number should be 100%. A 2013 Muttart Foundation survey revealed that nearly three-quarters of Canadians believe that charities spend too much on salaries and administration. Similarly, 52% said charities spend too much on fundraising. The survey also reveals a significant and increasing gap between Canadians’ views on the importance of this information and their views on how well charities provide it. This situation has likely been exacerbated recently with the emergence of charity ranking and rating organizations that often rely on low overhead expenses as a measure of success.

It is going to be a challenge to reconcile these opinions with the realities of our sector. We do not operate in a different universe than governments and business — one in which hard costs such as rent and wages do not exist. This growing interest in overhead expenses is occurring at the same time many funders are shifting their support to specific projects as opposed to general mission support.

What if other professions were evaluated only on their inputs? If you were presented with a list of all the teachers in a school and the amount of money they spent on their classrooms, would you automatically assume the teacher who had spent the least was the best? Likely not — you quite rightly would want additional information such as how well the students did on tests, how many graduated, etc. It seems unreasonable to apply this metric to charities and nonprofits.

Let’s look at an example of homeless youth. Someone who is truly against any overhead spending is free to give money directly to a young person in need. In this scenario there is a direct transfer of resources — no middle entity and no extra expenses — but also no value added to the street youth. The same conditions that led the person...
to live on the street may very well be present when that donation is spent. However, it is a different situation if that money is donated to an agency that provides training, low income housing and advocacy on behalf of youth. Yes there are hard costs to this intervention — but ultimately a greater chance for a better outcome for having invested the extra resources.

Staying with the street youth example, what if the agency discovers that one of its programs is only helping a small percentage of youth and as a result abandons that initiative in favour of one that, although more expensive, has produced better results? In this scenario the organization is able to help more people achieve a better result by spending more — anyone only looking at bottom line expenses would completely miss this and the opportunity to make a real impact on a serious problem.

There is research from Indiana University to suggest that spending too little is counterproductive. “Absent good, comparative information about program or mission effectiveness, donors and charity watchdogs often place excessive reliance on financial indicators. Of particular concern to us is the use of overhead cost and fundraising cost ratios as stand-ins for measures of program effectiveness. No organization in our study was an extravagant spender on fundraising or administration. Yet contrary to the popular idea that spending less in these areas is a virtue, our cases suggest that nonprofits that spend too little on infrastructure have more limited effectiveness than those that spend more reasonably.” ¹⁴

Fundraising Expenses

Imagine Canada is often asked to provide metrics to evaluate fundraising costs; however, there is no one-size-fits all answer to what an organization’s fundraising ratio should be. Further, a fundraising cost ratio is helpful but imperfect because it only measures a charity’s fundraising efficiency and cannot measure that charity’s overall efficiency or effectiveness.

A number factors influence the cost of fundraising

- Well-established organizations will likely have a greater return on investment than newer organizations.
- Organizations located in more affluent areas may have an easier time fundraising, and thus, lower costs.
- The popularity and public awareness

of a cause have an effect. Fundraising for a controversial cause may be more difficult.

- Starting up a new fundraising initiative will involve up-front costs that can temporarily skew the fundraising cost ratio.
- A donor acquisition mailing will have a much lower initial return on investment than a donor renewal mailing.
- The type or fundraising — for example with gaming or lottery activities, provincial laws govern prize payouts, and may require a minimum percentage of revenue to be allocated for prizes. This means that, even though the net amount raised is significant, the fundraising ratio will appear to be high.
- The return on investment for a special event will likely be lower than that of a major gifts program but the event may yield other benefits such as engaging current and prospective donors.
- To better understand the context in which the fundraising ratio is calculated, please see this article Fundraising costs: use context and caution in dialogue.

**Administrative Costs**

Numerous factors can affect administrative costs, which can vary widely depending on the nature of the charity’s activity, whether it is investing in new systems to support its operations, and other factors.

Few, if any, charities can operate effectively without incurring administrative costs. They reflect the real cost of operating an organization and include:

- ensuring good management, including financial systems, insurance, IT, recruitment of staff/volunteers, governance and communications with stakeholders;
- everyday essential items such as rent, electricity, hardware, software, salaries, travel, etc.;
- being transparent and accountable, including the production of annual reports, financial statements and audits, program evaluations and complying with relevant legislation; and,
- providing a safe environment for participants and beneficiaries, such as screening staff and volunteers who fulfill direct-service roles.

Without these investments, effective programs and services would be
impossible to deliver. Administrative costs, taken in isolation, are not an indicator of how effective a charity is.

Donors should have access to information about administrative costs and if they have questions, charities should be ready to provide answers.

Compensation
At Imagine Canada, we strongly believe in, and champion the need for, transparency and accountability, as seen in our Standards Program, Ethical Code, and CharityFocus. We also believe that workers in the charitable and nonprofit sector should be appropriately compensated for their work.

What are the facts about compensation?
The landscape of the charitable and nonprofit sector is extremely diverse: from very small volunteer-led community-based organizations to highly complex multi-million dollar operations often working at the national or international level.

In 2012 (data for the year is not quite complete at time of writing — 83,000 of about 86,000 charities reporting to date) T3010 data indicates that 2,517 charities had one or more employees earning $120,000 or more a year. This includes 432 organizations that had positions compensated at $250,000 or more. Roughly half of these charities are Hospitals, Universities and Colleges and the remainder tend to be other types of large and complex organizations.

In March 2013, the Harvard Business Review blog emphatically stated that nonprofits need to compete for top talent. “The nonprofit sector is facing a massive talent shortage, which makes scaling a social enterprise extraordinarily difficult. To achieve impact, it’s critical that social entrepreneurs attract, retain, and develop skilled talent. Competing directly with the private sector to do so is not only a good idea; it’s a necessity for the best organizations to succeed.”

The article goes on to note that nonprofits need to pay as competitively as possible and invest in leadership.

Compensation is an investment in impact. “High salaries should not signal a red light to not give just as low salaries should not signal a green light to give. Charity salary levels ought to be based on the skill, experience and education necessary to forward the work of the organization. Charities compete with businesses and the government for employees and must therefore offer reasonable wages in order to attract, hire

and retain competent people. Many charity employees are willing to sacrifice the higher pay in the private sector for the psychological rewards of working for a good cause. But underpaying employees could sabotage a charity’s programs if the only people willing to accept such low wages are unqualified to do the job. Underpaying lower level employees may be more damaging to an organization than paying top level executives too much. Charities that pay so little that they can’t retain their staff waste a lot of money by repeatedly recruiting and training new crops of employees, and losing valuable institutional knowledge in the process.16

How is compensation decided?
There is no one answer to the question of how much compensation a charity should offer compared to organizations in other sectors. There are market forces at play and individual organizations have to decide what they need to pay for the skills and results they require. These decisions, especially around executive level compensation, are best left in the hands of the Boards of Directors comprised of volunteers. Once these decisions are made, transparency about this information is essential.

The real issue with compensation: low salaries and poor benefits
When looking at compensation for people employed in the charitable and nonprofit sector, the real issue is more one of under- rather than over-compensation. Particularly smaller community-based organizations find it is a significant challenge to recruit and retain staff due to low salaries and poor benefits.

What should donors look for?
Given that the overhead ratio is not a good measure of effectiveness; donors should consider other factors, such as good management practices, belief in the charity’s mission and the organization’s impact. When looking at fundraising, donors should consider:

• if the charity participates in Imagine Canada’s Ethical Code, has been accredited through its new Standards Program or other accreditation body;
• whether the charity follows the requirements of the Association of Fundraising Professionals’ Donor Bill of Rights, which lists the ten expectations donors should have;
• signs of consistent management and stable costs over several years; and,

• whether the charity allows access to its most recent financial statements and lets people know if its fundraisers are volunteers, staff members or hired solicitors.

Many of the problems reported in the media about financial irregularities at a charity involve “percentage-based” fundraising. Percentage-based compensation means that a fundraiser — whether an individual or an organization — takes a percentage of each gift, regardless of actual expenses. AFP and Imagine Canada both prohibit this type of compensation and instead require fundraisers to work for a salary or fixed fee.

Volunteers

The argument on behalf of adequate compensation for staff does not negate the need for, and valuable contribution of, volunteers. Indeed, the sector would be crippled without volunteers who not only provide governance but support organizations with their expertise, experience, skills and perhaps most valuable of all, time. As Volunteer Canada puts it, “It is hard to imagine our country without volunteers — the men and women who donate their time to Canada’s… nonprofit organizations each year. Volunteers are active in youth clubs, arts programs, helping newcomers settle into their communities, visiting elderly people, and providing aid and comfort in hospitals. Without these volunteers, Canadian communities would be very different.”

Charity Ranking and Ratings

Imagine Canada encourages transparency and disclosure in our sector and agree that Canadians should have access to meaningful information to allow them to make informed choices. However, we are concerned that the ranking of charities does not provide complete and contextual information.

Carefully weighing the impact of an organization’s work is perhaps the most important assessment of a charitable organization and it is often ignored in ranking systems. With more than 170,000 charities and nonprofits in Canada, the sector is large, diverse and vibrant. These organizations work in many areas — arts and culture, education, environment, faith-based, health, human and social services, international development, sports and recreation — each requiring different approaches often, appropriately, resulting in differences in the cost of doing business. Even organizations doing similar work are difficult to compare given the variations in populations served and communities in which they work. Given this complexity and diversity, it would be difficult to find a ranking system that meaningfully compares and contrasts organizations.
Public Policy Work

What do we mean by charitable, political and partisan activities?

Charitable

Charities are called on to promote or advocate for their mission as part of their day-to-day operations. While it does not itself use the term “advocacy,” the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) recognizes that much of this charitable activity is not subject to any restrictions or limits in the Income Tax Act. According to the CRA, “when a registered charity makes a representation, whether by invitation or not, to an elected representative or public official, the activity is considered to be charitable. Even if the charity explicitly advocates that the law, policy, or decision by any level of government in Canada or a foreign country ought to be retained, opposed, or changed, the activity is considered to fall within the general scope of charitable activities.”

Political

CRA defines political activity as a call to political action such as encouraging the public to contact a public official in support of the charity’s position. Political activity must relate to a charity’s purpose and charities are generally not allowed to devote more than 10% of their resources to political activity. Note: making a gift to another qualified donee to support political activities is itself considered a political activity.

Partisan

Partisan political activity is the direct or indirect promotion of a political candidate or party, or the direct or indirect opposition to a political party or candidate. Partisan political activity by charities is explicitly banned.

CRA limits on the political activities of charities do not apply to nonprofits. This summary is for information purposes only, additional details on the CRA’s regulations on political activity by the charitable sector can be found at crc-arc.gc.ca (document reference: CPS-022).
How many charities engage in political activities?

According to Imagine Canada research in 2010, “just over a third (39%) of charities engaged in permitted political activities over the previous year. In terms of specific activities, charities are most likely to encourage the public to contact elected representatives or government officials (22%) or to make a statement to the media (19%)... most organizations engage in these activities irregularly (40%) or a few times a year (37%) — just 6% engage in them a few times a week or more.”

More details about Imagine Canada’s research on this issue, through its Sector Monitor Program on sectorsource.ca.

Why is it important that charities contribute to policy decisions?

Charities in Canada have a long and proud history of public policy work. For example, health charities were instrumental in advocating for smoke-free environments and substantially reduced tobacco consumption. Similarly, charities have contributed to the creation of the Registered Disability Savings Plan, the Canadian Initiative for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, the Treaty to End Land-Mines and the Canada-United States acid rain treaty.

Writing in The Philanthropist, Susan Carter adds to the list. “...nonprofit organizations are engaged at all stages of the process. They are most prominent in identifying issues in need of attention. Child poverty, poverty among the elderly, breast cancer, AIDS, famines and illiteracy, prisoner abuse, fragmentation within public and private pension systems, and the potential extinction of certain species of animals and birds — all emerged originally from organizations working at the community level and beyond.”

In their report The Role and Impact of Civil Society upon Child Rights in Canada, the authors note additional contributions originating at least in part from our sector, “...increased protections of children from sexual exploitation provided by amendments to the Criminal Code, a new Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA), tobacco control measures to reduce the number of young people taking up smoking, and changes to the Defence Act to prevent young people under the age of 18 from being deployed into hostilities.”

Susan Phillips, writing in The Philanthropist, expands on the role of charitable and nonprofit organizations in shaping public policy. “...the underlying model of Canadian civil society
remains rooted in a 19th century view of charity: that the purpose of charities is to provide services to the poor and disadvantaged supported primarily by private philanthropy. The choices of which causes to support are left largely to donors, and the role of governments is to keep charities honest and ensure that they spend these donations as they say they do... The notions of this sector as fundamental to citizenship and democracy, as community builder and social innovator, or as a force in economic development are largely absent from public discourse.”

In the spring of 2012, some politicians and the media questioned the right of charitable and nonprofit organizations to contribute to public policy debates. The sector argued strongly to the contrary, noting that charities are firmly rooted in their communities and bring a wide range of expertise to public policy issues and speak up for Canadians who are marginalized and unable to do so themselves. It would be detrimental to the country if we created an uneven playing field, restricting charities’ public policy engagement while continuing to facilitate lobbying by corporations. In our view, an engaged and informed citizenry is a prerequisite of a healthy and robust democracy. We never know where the next good idea is going to come from and ensuring that front-line organizations have the capacity to develop and share policy recommendations and participate in the process helps maintain a wide-open marketplace of ideas.

Among the strength our sector brings to policy debates: researching best practices in other jurisdictions; providing economic and technical analyses of policy options; evaluating proposed policies and initiatives against established environmental, economic and social benchmarks; providing public education; and ensuring that relevant and reasonable laws and policies are implemented.

Additional detailed examples of our sector’s impact on public policy can be found in the Impact section of this document.

---

Foreign Funding

Are charities allowed to accept funding from foreign sources?

During a recent public policy debate some critics of the sector raised the issue of foreign funding of Canadian charities. In a statement at the time, Imagine Canada noted that charities are allowed to accept funding from foreign sources just as Canadians are allowed to donate to causes they support in other countries. Many issues and causes are international in scope and there is a rich history of U.S.-based foundations supporting work in Canada. The T3010 form that charities must submit annually to CRA requires them to note if they receive funding from a foreign source for political activity.

What types of charities receive foreign funding?

Environmental organizations were singled out by critics as major recipients of foreign donations; however the range of Canadian charities receiving grants from the United States, for example, is as varied as the sector itself. Many of the largest grant recipients in 2010 are universities. Other recipients include health charities, hospitals, religious organizations and organizations providing services to the aboriginal population.

Based on information from the T3010 data file, there are roughly 1,400 charities that reported working in environment-related areas in 2011. About five percent of their total reported revenues came from outside Canada, for a total of just over $66 million in 2011. At the same time, these organizations derived roughly 28 percent of total revenues from domestic receipted and un-receipted donations and fundraising.

Advocacy, political activity and foreign funding, Imagine Canada.
impact
Rather than focusing on an organization's overhead expenses, the real measure is impact.
It is crucial that Canadians evaluate the work of charities and nonprofits in a new way. Rather than focusing on an organization’s overhead expenses, the real measure is impact. Given the vast number and wide variety of organizations there is no one-size-fits-all solution to measuring impact. Nor is it always easy to evaluate our work.

**Historical Perspective**

What do these three items have in common: Pacemakers, Pablum and Public Health Nurses?

The answer is that all of these things have their roots in the nonprofit sector!

- The implantable pacemaker was, in part, pioneered by the Heart and Stroke Foundation, as was the recent installation of defibrillator in public buildings;

- SickKids Hospital in Toronto is one of Canada’s most research-intensive hospitals and through research discoveries, such as Pablum in 1930, has helped saved the lives of countless children around the world;

- In the fight against tuberculosis (TB), private Canadian donors financed free sanatoria across the country, as well as the salaries of the first TB nurses. The latter helped demonstrate the importance of TB nurses (the precursor to the modern public health nurse) and the service was eventually taken over by public health departments and the Victorian Order of Nurses.

Many of the institutions and ideals that speak to the very core of what it is to be Canadian have their roots in philanthropic giving to charitable and nonprofit organizations. Consider the following examples from a 2007 Imagine Canada publication:

“In addition to creating and sustaining hospitals and various specialized healthcare services, philanthropy has also played an integral role in raising awareness of a number of health issues and in generating funds for research. Perhaps the most recognizable achievement of this kind is Terry Fox’s unforgettable Marathon of Hope, which taught Canadians about cancer and generated significant funds for cancer research... Philanthropy has also proved to be an important source of funding for medical research. Many medical advances, such as the discovery of the gene that causes cystic fibrosis, would not have been possible without the financial support of donors to health charities like the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.”

---


27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.
Public Policy

“Success is extremely difficult to assess, particularly in public policy campaigns designed to increase public awareness. Some high-profile campaigns are well-known when the result is a high-level program or international protocol such as the Treaty to End Land-Mines or the introduction of the National Child Tax Benefit. But is this the only definition of success? Success may result in policy change at the most senior level, but even that can be mitigated if the policy fails to hold, proves unsustainable, or crumbles under the first criticism. Success can also be seen in terms of increased awareness and attention to a particular problem or condition or in its ability to persuade the previously unconvinced of the seriousness of an issue. Finally, public policy success is sometimes defined as doing the best possible job on behalf of an organization’s clients.”

Following are detailed examples of our sector’s achievements and contributions toward meaningful public policy, specifically:

- The Registered Disability Savings Plan
- The development of poverty indicators
- Anti child-trafficking legislation
- Caregiver benefits
- Environmental initiatives

Registered Disability Savings Plan

The following is from the Planned Lifetime Advocacy Network (PLAN) website: “PLAN began in 1989 when a small group of parents gathered to consider how they could best support their son or daughter with a disability.” PLAN proposed, researched and campaigned for the Registered Disability Savings Plan (RDSP), a savings tool similar to a registered education savings plan, but designed specifically for people living with a disability. It took PLAN eight years to develop and gain legislative approval for its RDSP proposal. During that time, PLAN members mobilized families from their base in Vancouver and consulted with financial institutions, politicians and government bureaucrats to discuss and refine their proposal. Several elections interrupted the discussions requiring PLAN to brief and persuade new people.
“The RDSP helps hundreds of thousands of disproportionately poor Canadians living with a disability to lift themselves out of poverty, overcome isolation, and participate more fully in their communities.”

Plan highlights the impact with the following numbers:

- total deposits to date is over $445 Million;
- more than 46,500 RDSPs have been taken up since December 2008;
- the Big five Canadian banks offer the RDSP, as well as several credit unions;
- contributions from Families: over $165 million;
- contributions from Government Grants: over $199 million; and,
- contributions from Government Bonds over $82 million

PLAN notes that the RDSP is the first of its kind anywhere and is attracting attention throughout the world.

**Poverty Indicators**

Writing in *The Philanthropist*, Rachel Laforest shares two examples of impact in the area of poverty:

“In Ontario, the Daily Bread Food Bank, in collaboration with the Caledon Institute of Social Policy and with the support of the Metcalf Foundation, first developed the idea of a “deprivation index” as a means to distinguish the poor from the non-poor based on an assessment of their standard of living. The deprivation index is rapidly becoming a new standard in the measurement of poverty...

In Quebec, a different approach was taken in the selection of indicators to assess progress in poverty reduction.

A consultative committee on poverty and social exclusion... was established to produce recommendations on targets and actions to reduce poverty, reporting directly to the department in charge of the poverty reduction strategy. While mostly composed of government officials and academics, two members of voluntary organizations working with people living in poverty also participated in this committee. They were key players in the transfer of knowledge to various stakeholders engaged in the fight against...
poverty and social inclusion... Both the Ontario and Quebec examples illustrate the important leadership role voluntary organizations can play in the development of indicators. Organizations took it upon themselves to create opportunities for citizens to engage in the process and, as a result, it is more likely that these indicators will gain credibility and fervour with the citizenry.”

Anti Child-Trafficking Legislation
The impact of the charitable and non-profit sector extends beyond the Canadian border. With the full support of World Vision and other anti-trafficking organizations, Canada passed Bill C-268 in 2010 and in 2012 Bill C-310, which improve Canada’s ability to address the abuse of children by travelling sex offenders. These bills impose minimum sentences for child traffickers and allows for Canadian prosecution of trafficking crimes, such as child exploitation, that have been committed abroad.

Caregiver Benefits
In the late 1990s, The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation identified a focus on caregiving and respite issues.

After the Canadian Caregiver Coalition’s (CCC) re-organization in 2007, McConnell agreed to support the coalition’s work, in particular connecting CCC with experts in the art of policy development, advocacy and social change. By the 2011 federal election caregiving and the needs of Canada’s aging population were on every major political party’s platform. In a few short years the Coalition, which serves as the national voice for the needs and interests of family caregivers, can list a number of major achievements:

- all federal parties have a policy or position on family caregiving;
- debate on family caregiving in Parliament;
- positions on family caregiving in the provincial elections across the country in 2011;
- Caregiver Recognition Act in Manitoba;
- Caregiver Benefit program (formerly Caregiver Allowance) in Nova Scotia;

• expansion of family caregiver leave in Ontario; and,

• commitment in 2011 Budget in Quebec for caregivers supporting someone who cannot live alone.  

**Environmental Initiatives**

• An agreement between Canada and the United States to reduce sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions, effectively curtailing acid rain;

• the establishment of the *North American Waterfowl Management Plan* to protect wetlands in Canada;

• the establishment of over 1,000 new parks, wilderness areas and nature reserves between 1990 and 2000, which represented a doubling of the amount of protected area across the country;

• the *Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement*, which is an unprecedented collaboration between 21 major Canadian forest products companies and nine leading environmental organizations designed to accomplish objectives which include accelerating the completion of a protected spaces network and enhancing sustainable use of the boreal forest located outside of protected areas;

• the establishment and adoption of the Forest Stewardship Council certification system, which has led to healthier forests and a forest economy rooted in ecological principles; and,

• the declaration of Bisphenol A (BPA) as a toxic substance by the Government of Canada and the establishment of by-laws in a number of Canadian municipalities banning the use of cosmetic pesticides. 

---


34 *Brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance*, Canadian Environmental Grantmakers’ Network (CEGN), January 17, 2012.
Case Studies

Of course the sector has impact beyond public policy initiatives.

Pathways to Education

Pathways helps youth in low-income communities graduate from high school and successfully transition into post-secondary education. The Boston Consulting Group examined their work and concluded that Pathways to Education generates tremendous social economic value with a $24 return to society for $1 invested in the program.

A few additional highlights about Pathways' impact:

- dramatically decreases dropout rate;
- increases post-secondary enrolment for early cohorts;
- decreases violent and property crimes despite increases in neighbouring divisions; and,
- program grads enroll in university 10% more than the national average.

The research goes on to note that the program provides a number of quantifiable benefits to society by improving participant's education:

- increased general health outcomes, increased life expectancy;
- more preventative health care, less risk taking behaviour; and,
- reduced incidence of smoking, diabetes, hypertension, heart disease.

Big Brothers Big Sisters

Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada is marking its 100th anniversary with the release of a five-year study by the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health of almost 1,000 boys and girls registered with the organization.

Among the findings:

• girls with mentors were four times less likely to be bullies or get in fights than girls without a mentor; and,

• boys with mentors were three times less likely to suffer peer-pressure-related anxiety, and have fewer emotional problems than their non-mentored peers.

Photo credit: Big Brothers Big Sisters Calgary

Big Brothers
Big Sisters Canada celebrates 100 years of mentoring young people, Toronto Star online, February 22, 2013.
Kids Help Phone

Research conducted on behalf of Kids Help Phone indicates that the service is having a significant and positive impact on its users. As reported in the Toronto Star, 87% of callers to the 24-hour telephone counselling service report a "meaningful reduction" in distress while 75% of people using its live chat counselling service reported lower levels of distress. Among the other findings:

- 10% of callers identify themselves as being of First Nations or Métis heritage — twice their share of the Canadian population.
- The service reaches out to a high number — 32% in the survey — of young people living in rural communities.
- 41% of callers had or were undergoing counselling with an outside therapist, while 11% were on a waiting list.
- 73% of callers said they had a plan for dealing with their problem after counselling with Kids Help Phone services.
- 58% of respondents reported higher confidence in dealing with problems after counselling with Kids Help Phone services.
- 43% of survey respondents said it was the first time they had spoken with someone about their problem.37
Hidden Impact: Arts and Health

The sector’s impact on our health and wellbeing is not always immediately obvious. Consider the sometimes hidden impact of arts organizations as described in a 2013 report by Hill Strategies Research Inc.

“The data in the report show that there is a strong connection between 18 cultural activities and eight indicators of health and well-being (such as health, mental health, volunteering, feeling stressed, and overall satisfaction with life):

- art gallery visits are associated with better health and higher volunteer rates;
- theatre attendance is associated with better health, volunteering and strong satisfaction with life;
- classical music attendance is associated with higher volunteer rates and strong satisfaction with life; and,
- attendance at pop music events, cultural festivals and reading books are all associated with better health, volunteering, and strong satisfaction with life.
Summary

The charitable and nonprofit sector in Canada touches and enriches every aspect of our daily lives. These organizations are quite literally trying to change the world and they are succeeding. We encourage Canadians, who already trust our organizations, to broaden the lens through which our sector is viewed, to consider the value we have added to public policy, to seek volunteer opportunities, to consider the sector as a possible career destination, to explore ways to contribute and to acknowledge that real impact requires real investment.

Narrative: What’s Next?

This core resource will never truly be complete and in terms of our work on the narrative — it’s only the beginning. Our goal is to use this information as the starting point for the creation of key messages and other deliverables to begin shifting the conversation in Canada about the charitable and nonprofit sector.
stories from organizations
As part of our quest to create a new narrative, we invited members of our sector to share their stories of impact.
We don't anticipate that this section will ever be finished — indeed we welcome submissions from all Canadian charities and nonprofits.

A selection of these stories is the language in which they were submitted.
Health Charities Coalition of Canada (HCCC)

National health charities — specifically the member organizations of HCCC have a huge impact on Canadian society:

- over 3,500 Canadians are employed either full or part-time by our members. They support over 500,000 volunteers from coast to coast to coast who invest their time, energy and dedication to achieve the mission work of health charities;
- these charities are funded by over 17 million Canadians who donate to our member organizations and over 13 million patients and/or clients who receive direct services from us, such as web information, patient education and programs;
- national health charities were instrumental in the creation of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) which has led to greater investments in health research to find cures for a myriad of diseases;
- we provide much needed financial support to universities and teaching hospitals to conduct research;
- we are co-funders with the government on some of the most important leading health research in the world.

Members of the HCCC fund health research in the range of $200 million annually;
- national health charities have contributed to public awareness about the nation-wide inequities on access to medications, treatment and care across the broad spectrum of the healthcare system;
- we provide leadership in lifestyle change for prevention, early detection, management and quality of life;
- we are part of the vast network of services in the Canadian health system that develop and offer programs to support patients, families and caregivers; and,
- we translate knowledge gained through research to affect better public policy and better health outcomes for Canadians.
Toronto Western Hospital

The Gamma Knife is a 22-ton medical device used to treat people with benign brain tumours, drug-resistant neurological disorders and vascular malformations. The non-invasive treatment uses beams of radiation electronically programmed to zap lesions. The benefits of this type of therapy are increased cure rates and the decreased risk of hemorrhage, infection and other post-operative complications.

In 2003, neurosurgeons at University Health Network’s Krembil Neuroscience Centre petitioned the Ontario Ministry of Health for a Gamma Knife. At that time, Canada had just two, one in Winnipeg and one in Sherbrooke, Que. Each year, the Ontario government spent $1.2 million to send 36 Ontarians for treatments — most to the United States.

In December, the Ministry agreed to redirect that money to Toronto’s University Health Network to establish a provincial Gamma Knife program that would be able to treat 300 patients annually. However, while the $1.1 million would cover the annual operating costs, the hospital was now asked to find $7 million to actually buy a Gamma Knife.

University Health Network then turned to Toronto General and Western Hospital Foundation to raise the $7 million ($5 million for the machine itself and $2 million for the site preparation and supplementary equipment). Thanks to a $3.5-million gift from an anonymous donor, a $3-million gift from Joey and Toby Tanenbaum and a number of smaller donations from the community, the Gamma Knife was purchased, installed and operational by September 2005. Within the first few years of operation, the hospital was able to double the number of patients who received treatment each year. Building on this success, a second Gamma Knife was installed at Princess Margaret Hospital in 2009.
Some organizations answered the question,

“What would happen if you ceased to exist?”
Without Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Southern Alberta Chapter (CPAWS SAB), our province’s most populous park and recreation area, Kananaskis Country, would not exist. Neither would wildlife overpasses in Banff National Park. Without CPAWS, Alberta’s wildlife would not be as protected and free to move across our landscape as they are right now.
Sans le CCCI, il n’existerait pas de voix commune pour les praticiens en développement international issus d’une grande diversité d’organisations, pour influencer les politiques d’aide internationale canadienne envers un développement durable, soutenu et égalitaire pour les pays en développement.
Environmental Defence

Without Environmental Defence, Canadian kids would still be subjected to hormone-disrupting toxic chemicals like bisphenol A and phthalates in their baby bottles and toys. Without Environmental Defence, the Ontario Greenbelt — now the largest in the world — would not exist across southern Ontario and all the invaluable farmland, wildlife habitats and river headwaters that the Greenbelt protects would be at risk.
Le Groupe de développement durable du Pays de Cocagne

Grâce aux efforts du Groupe de développement durable du Pays de Cocagne, jusqu’à 200 millions de litres d’eaux usées domestiques ont été détournées vers des champs d’épuration plutôt que de se rendre non traitées aux eaux de baies et de rivières du détroit de Northumberland.
Sans Moisson Montréal, près de 75 000 personnes par mois souffriraient de la faim à Montréal.
over 700,000 Canadians would lose the opportunity to know the joy of helping an individual child overcome poverty and injustice and break free from the cycle of poverty;

6.5 million children would not have the opportunity to go to school, be protected from disease and sickness, have access to clean water and nutritious food;

we would continue to see over 7 million children die before their 5th birthday simply because they don’t have access to the most basic medical care and interventions; and,

we would not be able to engage in dialogue with our own Canadian government, as well as international governments and bodies, to come up with solutions to better protect children and families from injustice and harm.
Others took a "Did you know?" approach.
Canadian Council of Christian Charities

Places of worship are the common link between Canada’s most civic-minded citizens. About 9% of Canadians attend weekly, but they give 46% of all donations and 40% of all volunteer hours. They have a higher rate of directly helping others as well.

The majority of environmental organizations across Canada are built from small, dedicated groups of volunteers who care deeply about their local environment. Without the Canadian Environmental Network, hundreds of small environmental groups would have no voice on the national stage.
Fondation de l'École Peter Hall

Saviez-vous que, sans la Fondation de l'École Peter Hall, des milliers d'élèves de 4 à 21 ans de Montréal, de la Rive-Sud et de la Rive-Nord seraient privés d'une éducation adaptée sur mesure à chacun d'eux et aussi de l'accès à de l'équipement spécialisé pour les aider à devenir plus autonomes dans leur famille et dans la société?
Giv3

Less than 1 in 4 Canadian tax returns claim a charity credit. This has been declining for 20+ years. Giv3 is a unique movement with a mission is to encourage more Canadians to be more giving. Without public awareness and education, charitable giving and volunteering will likely continue to decline and all Canadian charities will suffer.
The Hospital for Sick Children

- SickKids is one of Canada’s most research-intensive hospitals and through research discoveries, such as Pablum in 1930, has helped save the lives of countless children around the world;

- SickKids is home to the largest, most comprehensive paediatric medical and surgical training programs in Canada. Last year alone, we trained over 800 residents and 430 clinical fellows from around the world;

- SickKids Foundation is the largest charitable funder of child health research, learning and care in Canada; and,

- Did you know that SickKids researchers are on the cutting edge of stem cell research? Most recently, they created lung cells from the skin cells of patients with cystic fibrosis, bringing hope for better treatment for children with this disease.
MiningWatch Canada

MiningWatch Canada is the only national, independent organization focused on documenting the impacts of the mining industry while promoting improved standards for companies operating in Canada and Canadian companies abroad. Without MiningWatch, affected communities and Indigenous peoples would be without credible, critical information about the industry's social and environmental impacts.
My Sustainable Canada (MSC) was recognized as a 2012 Local Food Champion by the Greenbelt Foundation for its ground-breaking work in helping Ontario healthcare institutions measure, track and shift their food purchasing dollar towards more local food. MSC worked with and sourced Ontario food for St. Joseph’s Health System Group Purchasing Organization’s 28 health care facilities by including local food language in their requests for proposals. This led to a 15% increase in local food purchased, representing $670,000 in sales.
The Natural Step Canada

Through award-winning learning programs and advisory, coaching, and process facilitation services, The Natural Step Canada has helped thousands of leaders and hundreds of organizations translate the fundamentals of sustainability into practical steps for creating long lasting change.
Did you know that the Ontario Nonprofit Network works with, and for, the province’s 55,000 charities and nonprofits to act collectively on policy and strategy for the nonprofit sector, and works with the Provincial Government and businesses to help make Ontario communities vibrant and resilient places to live?
Plan Canada

Without the work of Plan in 2012, almost 174 million people — including 84 million children — in 50 developing countries across Africa, Asia and the Americas would not have received the tools, training and support they need to break the cycle of poverty and build sustainable solutions for improving their own lives.
United Way Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox & Addington

The United Way serving Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox & Addington is the largest non-government funder of social services in our community providing support to critical programs that benefit local residents. In fact, last year more than 85,000 people benefited from United Way funded programs helping them to live with hope, dignity and a sense of belonging.
West Coast Environmental Law

Without the work of environmental lawyers at West Coast Environmental Law and others in the charitable and nonprofit sector, we would not have two million acres of protected forest in the Great Bear Rainforest, one of the world’s most biodiverse and largest remaining tracts of unspoiled temperate rainforest.
Wildsight

- Wildsight volunteers contribute approximately 6,000 hours to our east Kootenay communities every year;

- Wildsight’s efforts led to Ramsar designation (a List of Wetlands of International Importance) for the Columbia Wetlands;

- Wildsight has gotten over 35,000 school kids outside to learn in our curriculum based environmental education programs;

- Wildsight was a key partner in pushing through the ban on mining in the Flathead Valley;

- Wildsight contributes to our local economy by employing (or contracting) 16 seasonal educators and 13 regular time contractors;

- Wildsight was recognized for innovation, collaboration and leadership in conservation by the BC Real Estate Foundation for their Lake Windermere Project;

- Wildsight partners with the Canadian Cancer Society to work on pesticide reduction in our communities. We were recognized, along with our partners, with the Cancer Society’s Circle Distinction Award;

- Through the provincial Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) process, Wildsight helped secure multiple key protected area designations. The Flathead is now the largest area off limits to mining and oil and gas development in BC outside of a park; and,

- The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency chose Wildsight’s water stewardship work as a national best practices example in community based ecological monitoring. Living Lakes Canada trains citizens to monitor the water quality in their watershed and helps them to get baseline data that currently does not exist.
**Women’s Health Environment Network (WHEN)**

WHEN has provided hundreds of women with the knowledge and confidence to take action for prevention by addressing a variety of environmentally linked health issues through film screenings, newcomer workshops, and the Wannabe Toxic Free campaign.
These are merely highlights of the thousands of ways Canadian charities and nonprofits — their staff, volunteers and donors alike — are changing our world for the better.

Beyond all other considerations, it is this impact which is the true measure of our sector.