

AFP - FELLOWSHIP IN INCLUSION AND PHILANTHROPY

DEVELOPING A CULTURE OF DIVERSE & INCLUSIVE SUPPORTER COMMUNICATIONS

GREENPEACE CANADA

WANJIRO NDUNGU & ANIL KANJI



- COVER OF THE WINTER 2016 GREENPEACE CANADA MAGAZINE FOR SUPPORTERS

GREENPEACE

FELLOWSHIP IN
INCLUSION AND
PHILANTHROPY

PROGRAMME DE
PERFECTIONNEMENT
EN INCLUSION ET
PHILANTHROPIE

Introduction & Executive Summary

As a large global campaigning organization, Greenpeace is highly visible across media. From newspapers to television to the web and our social feeds, Greenpeace communications make their way into households around the world.

The people that we talk to the most are our supporters: 20 million strong, with 3 million of them donating to us on a regular basis. We have an opportunity and **responsibility** to ensure we are following the “platinum rule” when speaking to our supporters, starting by following best practices and making efforts to evaluate all touchpoints and communications with them from a diversity and inclusion lens.

As we began our 2016 AFP Inclusive Philanthropy Fellowship Project on diversity and inclusion in donor communications, we decided that the best way to create change was to start at Greenpeace Canada, developing a process evaluating communications for inclusive language and imagery. Our goal was to create a tool that would be seen as helpful, versus an additional “box ticking” exercise staff had to complete when preparing communications for our supporters.

Recognizing that our organization had already committed to being more diverse and inclusive, our goal was to ensure inclusive language in fundraising communications, ensuring we were speaking to more diverse groups of potential donors, and to make our digital communications accessible to comply with government guidelines.

We began our process by scoping an audit of all communications materials that a new or existing supporter would receive from the organization within a calendar year.

We also began framing out the methodology we’d use to evaluate these materials; the lenses we’d use to determine what worked and what could be better about the communications we’d be sending to our supporters.

Finally, we identified the stakeholders in the organization who we’d need to engage in the process of developing a sustainable process. We’d need our fundraising colleagues on board for certain, but also key members of our digital communications team who sent out emails and posted to social media on a regular basis.

As we completed our audit and synthesized our evaluation methodology, we emerged with a product we're extremely excited about: a diversity and inclusion checklist that we'll be piloting internally in the winter 2016-2017 period. We invite other colleagues in the Fellowship to also use the checklist and help us make it better. We will be also sharing the checklist with our global Greenpeace Diversity & Inclusion Community members who can take it back to their National Regional Offices.

Overall we consider our project an enriching experience that has added value to our organization as well as our personal perspectives. As of this autumn, all new supporter communications materials produced have incorporated elements of our D&I checklist, and our hope is that after an initial pilot, our Digital Team will incorporate it into their workflow going forward.

Recap: Project proposal

Diversity and Inclusion in Donor Communications - Greenpeace

Goal

In our mission to be a more diverse and inclusive organization, we must revisit our fundraising communications to ensure we are speaking to a diverse group of donors, and make our digital communications accessible to comply with government guidelines.

Objectives

By the end of 2016, all Greenpeace Canada supporter-facing communications products will be revised to use more inclusive language, and our digital communications will meet accessibility standards as defined by Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 Level A.

Strategies

- Identify existing and target audiences to ensure future communications are in the audience's preferred formats and also sent through their preferred channels

-
- The D&I team will develop a checklist to evaluate existing communications materials, auditing all supporter facing communications through this D&I lens. Once developed, this donor communications checklist will be shared with the global Greenpeace organization. After this communications audit a revision schedule will be made, prioritizing the most important pieces, along with a workback schedule to revise these products in a timely fashion.
 - The website & emails sent to supporters currently do not comply with WCAG - we will identify what needs to be done to bring these products up to appropriate accessibility standards.

Workplan Summary

1. Develop list of sources for evaluation framework of supporter materials.
 - a. GP Global Brand Guide
 - b. [A Progressive's Style Guide](#)
 - c. AFP D&I Fellowship webinar/session materials
 - d. Greenpeace D&I Community Group
 - e. Internal Greenpeace Canada style guides
2. Review materials:
 - a. Welcome materials for new supporters , General [Brochure](#)
 - b. [Impact Report](#), Greenpeace Canada Magazines in English and French
 - c. Website
 - d. Direct Mail
3. Deliver recommendations for revising existing materials (where possible), and guidelines/checklist for creation of new materials going forward.

Developing an Evaluation Framework

The primary focus of our evaluation was on diverse and inclusive language in supporter communications, online and offline. Part of our objective was also to ensure Greenpeace Canada's website would meet accessibility standards as defined by Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 Level A. Upon meeting with our web team we were assured that our website (greenpeace.ca) met most of the Principles of WCAG 2.0, and the others would be addressed in an [overhaul of all global Greenpeace websites](#) in early 2017. Given this feedback we decided to refine the scope of our evaluation to focus solely on language and communications.

Our first step was to understand our existing audience. We dove deep into our data to create profiles based on age, geography, and language (English or French). This initial step of data analysis led to two recommendations for the organization:

1. Improving data quality and comprehensiveness should be an organizational goal. We need to develop a culture that values collecting demographic data with each and every email, phone call, survey, and petition. It has the added benefits of supporting our lead generation efforts and improving donor communications by creating targeted solicitations and helping to build deeper relationships with donors, thus boosting donations
2. The initial data deep dive should be used to identify areas in Canada where we have proportionately little representation or presence, and to develop strategies for how we can be more inclusive of those communities in our communications.

Building guidelines:

Once we had a clearer sense of our audience we began diving into evaluation. We quickly realized that without a consistent, agreed-upon process we would not be making coherent, quality recommendations in a sustainable way.

We narrowed down our tools to the following:

Tool	Use case
GP Global Brand Guide	We decided to use this product because it was written to help Greenpeace target a global audience, in other words individuals coming together from a variety of backgrounds around a common cause. While it doesn't discuss D&I per se it reminds us to "internationalize" our thinking about who could be reading our materials at any given time.
A Progressive's Style Guide	A groundbreaking new tool from Sum of Us, we felt this could be a powerful guide to D&I especially for digital communications.
AFP Inclusion & Philanthropy Materials	The CCDI webinar concepts such as "unintentional intolerance", "bias" and "allyship" proved extremely helpful.
Greenpeace Diversity and Inclusion Community	A forum for discussing timely diversity and inclusion issues. Serves as important ongoing inspiration for our work, and reminder of the relevance of D&I policies.
Internal Informal Guides	Existing style guides (not public): 1) Allyship with Arctic Indigenous Communities_ 2) Greenpeace Canada Tone of Voice for Digital 3) Informal best practices for an English/French audience,

Building on and borrowing from the concepts contained in these tools, we came up with a list of questions to guide us in our evaluation process, listed in Appendix A.

Evaluation:

We put together a list of all communications pieces that would typically be sent to a supporter in a calendar year, and went through the checklist with each one:

Product (in English & French)	Frequency	When Revised Next	Recommendations
Welcome Pack - Letter	Once, Year 1	2017 as part of Welcome Cycle Refresh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accessibility: use of large and legible fonts
Welcome Pack - Brochure	Once, Year 1	2017 as part of Welcome Cycle Refresh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally good at showing diversity of movement• Some low contrast text harder to read• Images of groups of people should be reinforced by copy so that they are “subjects” vs “objects”
Welcome Pack - Envelope	Once, Year 1	2017 as part of Welcome Cycle Refresh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Text could be higher contrast
Impact Report	Once, Yearly, Digital	Q2 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low contrast text• Good use of images• Feature supporters with an eye towards reflecting the diversity of donors who support Greenpeace•
Greenpeace Magazine	Twice, Yearly	Q1 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gender neutral language• Increase visibility of diverse communities• Include and engage Programs & Comms dept in comms strategy• Donor participation - in writing articles etc• Considering we have many GP donors who are aging - we should explore the possibility of offering audio version
Direct Mail Packages	Four+, Yearly	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoid long and complex sentences• Use of 1st person pronoun “you” when addressing donor promotes inclusiveness
Digital - Email Comms, Social	Multiple times a month	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nothing contentious was seen in recent emails or social media posts (past 6 months), though we recall certain terms being used in the past that

			<p>should be avoided: “ancient” when referring to energy infrastructure for example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails do not use images
Digital - Website	Refreshed daily	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We evaluated the following sections of the website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Home Page ○ About Us ○ Donate ○ Our campaigns ○ Act
Events	Yearly or more	Q1 2017	<p>We evaluated two events held this year for supporters, one with a celebrity invited to highlight the Arctic/Clyde River appeal for funds and the other, an Open Boat/donor appreciation event at Halifax</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choose an accessible location with wheelchair ramps, elevators, bathrooms close by • Ensure there’s adequate seating for attendees • Increase accessibility by providing ASL interpretation
Overall			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We noticed in most Greenpeace supporter communications a tendency to favour militant or “battle” themed language. Our core narratives seem to use words like “struggle”, “fight”, “marching” and be centred around concepts of protracted conflict. While maybe not strictly a D&I issue language like this makes us accessible to supporters who believe in similar narratives, but does not leave room for those who may support our mission but have a more nuanced view towards campaigning for change

The first product that was developed with a version of our checklist was the winter version of [Greenpeace Magazine](#). While we were mostly happy with the outcome, we did identify process failure that led to some articles not meeting our standards.



- For Greenpeace Magazine, we saw our recommendations around images and representation well reflected in the final product.
- Clear, accessible language was used throughout the magazine
- Gender-friendly language was used.
- Because we did not have a checklist in place, there are two articles in the magazine that we feel could have been even better from an inclusive language perspective. In the article about the Amazon, we should have highlighted an individual or two from the Mundruku tribe versus referring to them as a homogenous group. Similarly in the article about the partnership between MSF and Greenpeace we should have tried to tell the story of single refugee, personifying individuals better. We have flagged this with specific questions on our checklist for next time.

Rolling out the checklist & Conclusion

Our final step was to take the evaluation process we had used to evaluate the supporter communications materials, and evolve it into a tool that could be used by other communications teams internally. Aiming for simplicity and ease of use, we developed the checklist in Appendix A. Our goal with the checklist was to have teams think through D&I issues when creating communications products. Rather than a prescriptive list of do's and don'ts, we wanted our tool to be more of a conversation starter.

The tool will be piloted amongst our Digital Team in Winter 2016-2017, and it is our hope other Fellows will use it in their external supporter communications work and help us improve it.

As Krishan Mehta said in an address to Inclusion in Philanthropy Fellows, there's a shift happening in giving today away from old charitable models to the concept of "social financing". Donors are looking for more than just a cause to support, they want to be engaged with the organization and feel like they're part of the mission. Inclusiveness in language and how we invite supporters to join us is becoming more important than ever before. It's our hope that tools like our checklist will help encourage a culture of thoughtfulness and care in crafting inclusive communications for diverse audiences.

APPENDIX A: D&I Checklist

For any given communications piece, we asked:

1. Who is the intended audience of the piece?

WORDS

1. Is this piece available in English and French?
2. Does language appear welcoming to all genders (e.g. are we avoiding use of words such as “mankind”)?
3. Is there any language that could be construed as ageist (e.g. are we using words such as “ancient”, “antiquated”, “childish”, “immature” in a derisive way?)
4. Are we using terms avoided by disability rights activists (e.g. “crippled”, “idiot”, “slow”, “falling on deaf ears”)
5. Are we using terms avoided by economic justice advocates (e.g. “disadvantaged”, “financial security”)?
6. If mentioning Indigenous allies, communities or populations are we adhering to the style guide in “Allyship with Arctic Indigenous Communities_ Engagement Guidelines 2015”
7. Are we using racially-charged language or play on any cultural stereotypes (e.g. “minority”, “multicultural”)?
8. Are we referring to marginalized groups in a homogeneous way i.e. painting an entire group with a single brush (e.g. *desperate refugees*) without efforts to tell individual stories?

IMAGES

9. Are images and text clear and legible (e.g. no thin or low-contrast fonts)?
10. Do the images reflect our the diversity of our movement and community?
11. Do they reflect the “subjects” of our campaigns and work versus people as “objects”?

-
12. Do images depict cultural stereotypes, age stereotypes, gender stereotypes?
 13. Are we using an image of a person/a group of people that does not relate to the copy/content (e.g. using them as stock imagery objects)?
 14. Are there intersectional issues we have the opportunity to highlight/lift up?