

Submission to the draft report on the Future foundations for giving.

In relationship to identifying opportunities to increase philanthropic giving and how this aligns with the priorities of the broader community, I see a few issues.

- One of the comments in the draft above Figure 3, “some doners believe that low administration costs mean that a charity is more efficient and effective, the Commission’s analysis shows that this is likely to be an inaccurate reflection of a charity’s performance”. It would be useful to have some guide to help people donating. We have seen in the past natural disasters, that people are saying on social media that they won’t give again, I think because they had a belief that all of there money would go to the disaster and everyone works for free, so there is no administration costs.

So, a guide for performance indicators would be useful.

- Box 1 – What is the price of giving. If this is compared to the last paragraph of page 18. The removal of DGR status for School building funds for primary and secondary schools could have a detrimental outcome.

The example is for a \$2,000 dollar donation towards a building fund, then the government is paying \$650 to that building fund.

The removal of DGR status would require higher school fees for repair/renewal of these non-government schools. This would most likely cause some students to move to government schools.

This will increase the cost to taxpayers, as the cost per student is higher for government school students compared to non-government school students when Federal and State costs are added together.

This will require extra money to be required for building projects for government schools.

So this the return on the investment of \$650 from the government in a tax return, gives them \$2,000 towards building improvements at schools.

I actually see this as a great investment for improved schooling in our nation.

Regards
John Hicks