

PATHWAYS TO GROWTH

Grant Writing • Consulting • Capacity Building

AI IN GRANT WRITING: Findings from the Field

Primary Research Among Professional Grant Writers

Published by Pathways to Growth • 2026

Executive Summary

Artificial intelligence is no longer on the horizon for the nonprofit sector—it has arrived. The question facing nonprofit executives, board members, and grant professionals is no longer whether AI will shape the future of grant writing, but how to harness it wisely.

Pathways to Growth (P2G) stands in a unique position to answer that question. As one of the nation’s most experienced nonprofit grant writing and consulting firms—with more than 20 years of sustained excellence, a nationally recognized team of 10 to 15 seasoned professionals, and a client reach extending across multiple sectors and states—we have both the depth of practice and the breadth of perspective to see AI clearly. We are not speculating about what AI might mean for grant writing. Our team works with it every day, across dozens of client engagements, under real competitive conditions. What follows is what we are continuously discovering.

In 2026, P2G conducted a structured internal survey of our professional grant writing team. The survey captured firsthand practitioner insight from writers with deep combined experience serving nonprofit clients in health, human services, faith-based organizations, family services, education, and beyond. Their responses are candid, specific, and grounded in daily professional reality.

Key Findings at a Glance

80%	of P2G grant writers report AI has improved proposal quality
100%	agreed: skilled human expertise remains essential — AI cannot currently replace the professional judgment, relational intelligence, and narrative craft that make proposals fundable
70%	use AI for less than 25% of their total work, reflecting intentional and bounded use by experienced professionals
0	respondents believe AI will fully replace professional grant writers — but all agree the role is evolving

This white paper presents our findings across five domains: how AI is being used, its impact on quality and efficiency, the human elements of grant writing, the ethics and funder landscape, and the policy implications for organizations navigating this shift. We also situate our findings within the broader philanthropic landscape—one that is growing, diversifying, and becoming more competitive.

Our central argument: AI is a powerful tool for the grant writing profession—but the nonprofit organizations that will benefit most are those that pair it with skilled, experienced human expertise. The proposals that secure funding are not written by algorithms. They are crafted by professionals who understand funders, know their clients deeply, and bring irreplaceable strategic and narrative judgment to every page.

Introduction: The Stakes Have Never Been Higher

Something has shifted in the way nonprofit organizations talk about grant writing. In leadership meetings, board rooms, and funder webinars, the same question keeps surfacing: “Should we be using AI for this?”

It is a fair question—and a consequential one. For many nonprofits, grant revenue is not supplemental income. It is critical. The quality, timing, and strategic alignment of a grant proposal can determine whether a program runs, whether staff are retained, whether communities are served.

The good news: the philanthropic landscape is expanding. According to Giving USA 2025, total U.S. charitable giving reached \$592.5 billion in 2024—a record high and a 6.3% increase over 2023. Foundation grantmaking alone surpassed \$109 billion for the third consecutive year. There are now more than 86,000 grantmaking entities in the United States. The opportunity for nonprofits with compelling cases and strong proposals remains strong.

The challenge: competition has intensified at the same pace. With more funders, more grant seekers, and more sophisticated AI tools available to all applicants, the quality bar for proposals is rising. A generic, competent proposal is no longer enough. Funders are looking for organizations they trust, causes they believe in, and writing that moves them to act.

Into this environment, AI has entered with considerable momentum and considerable hype. Tools like Claude, ChatGPT, and others promise to write faster, research smarter, and produce cleaner copy. Some funders are explicitly welcoming AI assistance. Others are quietly concerned. Most nonprofit executives are caught somewhere in between—curious, cautious, and not entirely sure what to believe.

At Pathways to Growth, we decided not to speculate. We asked the people who actually write the grants and work with nonprofit leaders across the country on a daily basis.

About This Research

In 2026, P2G conducted an internal survey of our professional grant writing team. Our writers are not generalists who occasionally work with nonprofits. They are specialists with extensive

combined experience working exclusively with nonprofit and mission-driven organizations across health, human services, faith-based ministry, family services, education, disability, fatherhood engagement and other sectors. Several hold advanced degrees in social work, nonprofit management, public administration, and communications. Many have worked directly inside nonprofit organizations before joining P2G and others have worked as foundation leaders, giving them firsthand understanding of what funders actually fund—and why.

This insider perspective is the foundation of P2G’s value proposition and the reason our team’s assessment of AI carries weight. Our team writes hundreds of grant proposals each year. When our writers evaluate what AI can and cannot do, they are measuring it against the standard that actually wins grants—not against a theoretical ideal.

The survey covered five thematic areas:

- Current AI usage patterns and tools
- Impact on proposal quality and professional efficiency
- The human elements of grant writing that AI cannot replicate
- Ethics, funder perceptions, and transparency
- Policy guidance and the broader professional future

Ten experienced grant writers completed the survey. Their responses are frank, grounded, and in some cases surprising. This white paper synthesizes those findings into actionable insight for nonprofit leaders, funders, and the professionals who serve them.

A Note on Research Validity

Some readers may wonder whether practitioners’ assessments of AI are influenced by a natural interest in preserving their professional roles. This is a fair and important question, and we address it directly in Section 3. The short answer: our team’s observations about AI’s limits are specific, consistent, and corroborated by external research—and on several dimensions, our writers acknowledged AI capabilities that actually exceed their initial expectations. Self-interest alone does not produce the nuanced and sometimes self-critical assessments found in this dataset.

Section 1: How Professional Grant Writers Are Actually Using AI

The first finding of our research is perhaps the most important corrective to popular assumption: professional grant writers are not handing their work to AI. They are deploying it selectively, for specific tasks, within a broader workflow that remains human-led.

The Critical Role of Prompting

Before examining use cases, it is essential to understand a dimension of AI use that is often overlooked in public discussion: the quality of AI output is almost entirely dependent on the quality of the instructions given to it. In AI terminology, these instructions are called “prompts,” and the skill of crafting them—prompt engineering—is itself a key discipline.

A grant writer who knows how to prompt AI effectively can dramatically accelerate quality work. A grant writer (or nonprofit staff member) who does not will get generic, unfocused, or inaccurate output that requires as much revision as starting from scratch. This means that AI does not reduce the need for expertise—it changes where that expertise is applied. The judgment required to direct AI well is itself a form of professional skill that takes time to develop.

“The quality of what AI produces is only as good as the quality of the questions and direction you give it. Garbage in, garbage out—that principle has never been more true.”

Where AI Is Being Applied

When asked what they use AI for most, our team identified five primary use cases. It is worth noting that not every writer uses AI for every task listed—and in particular, research is an area where writer practice varies significantly, with some professionals relying more heavily on traditional database tools and others integrating AI into their research workflow. The percentages below reflect usage among those who reported using AI for that category:

AI Use Case	Reported Usage Among Users
-------------	----------------------------

Editing and proofreading	Widely used
Drafting support / idea organization	Widely used
Needs statement research and data	Selectively used
Summarizing lengthy RFPs and documents	Selectively used
Funder prospecting support	Selectively used

Notably absent from this list: full proposal generation. Not a single respondent described using AI to write complete grant applications from scratch. The pattern is one of augmentation—applying AI to discrete tasks within a human-directed process.

The 25% Rule: Intentional, Bounded Use

When asked what percentage of their current work involves AI assistance, 70% of respondents indicated less than 25%. Three writers reported 25–50%, and one reported 50–75%—the highest user, notably, also expressed the most candid concern about the tool’s risks.

“It’s gotten me lazier mentally.”

This self-critical observation from our highest AI user points to something important: professional grant writers are actively managing their relationship with the tool. They are using it where it saves time without substituting it for the thinking that makes proposals competitive.

For nonprofit organizations evaluating their own AI use, this usage pattern from experienced professionals offers an important benchmark: bounded, intentional, task-specific deployment guided by skilled human judgment is the standard, not the exception.

Section 2: What AI Is Actually Improving—and Where It Falls Short

Where AI Genuinely Helps

Our team was specific and practical about where AI adds value. The most commonly cited benefits fell into four categories:

1. Clarifying and Organizing Ideas

Multiple writers described using AI as a thinking partner at the start of a project—particularly when facing a blank page or an unfamiliar program area.

“I have found AI most helpful for clarifying my thinking and helping me to organize my ideas.”

2. Editing to Meet Word and Character Counts

Grant applications routinely impose strict word limits. Several writers identified AI as excellent at trimming narrative while preserving meaning—a mechanical task that previously required significant time.

3. Research and Needs Statement Development

AI is useful for surfacing data, framing needs statements, and providing background on topics unfamiliar to the writer. One respondent noted its value for needs statements and data from program areas outside her primary expertise—while emphasizing that all research must be independently verified.

4. Throughput: More Grants in Less Time

One of the practical questions nonprofit leaders ask is whether AI allows professional grant writers to produce more proposals in the same timeframe. The honest answer from our team: yes, in some cases—but not as dramatically as popular accounts suggest. AI can accelerate certain tasks like editing, initial drafting, and document summarization. But the strategic thinking, client knowledge, and funder relationship intelligence that determine whether a proposal wins cannot be sped up by a tool. Quality proposals still require the time they require.

The Critical Caveat: Accuracy Must Always Be Verified

Every benefit cited above came with a consistent qualifier: AI requires human verification.

Writers reported three categories of AI error:

- Fabricating organizational facts — AI made assumptions about clients' programs that were inaccurate
- Missing recent updates — AI may lack the most current statistics or policy context
- Losing nuance — AI summaries can flatten complexity, missing contextually significant details

One writer summarized the operating standard that emerged across the team: “All research is always manually confirmed.” This is not a minor caveat—it is a professional discipline. Nonprofit organizations evaluating AI tools should build verification workflows into any AI-assisted grant process.

External Research Corroborates This Finding

A 2026 study by Northwestern University's Innovation Institute analyzed NIH and NSF grant proposals from 2021 through 2025 and found that signs of AI-assisted writing rose sharply beginning in 2023. Interestingly, proposals with higher levels of AI involvement were more likely to receive NIH funding—suggesting that when AI is used skillfully, it can enhance rather than diminish proposal quality. The key word is “skillfully.” The study underscores that AI does not improve outcomes on its own; it amplifies the capabilities of the professionals directing it.

Section 3: What AI Cannot Yet Do—The Essential Human Elements

If the findings in Sections 1 and 2 could be summarized as “AI helps in bounded ways,” the findings in this section represent the heart of our research: there are things that make grant proposals fundable that AI—at its current stage of development—cannot reliably provide.

We use the word “yet” with intention. AI capabilities are advancing rapidly, and intellectual honesty requires acknowledging that some of the limits described here may shift over time. But as of 2026, our team’s daily experience is clear: the following elements remain essentially human.

Emotional Resonance and Storytelling

The capacity to craft a story that moves a funder—to convey real human impact with authentic emotional weight—was identified as one of AI’s most significant current limitations. However, our team was more nuanced here than a simple “AI can’t do emotion.”

“The emotion is lost on AI. It can take a story and reorganize it, but it can’t make it emotional.”

What AI currently lacks is not the ability to produce emotionally inflected language—it can do that. What it lacks is the raw material: the real story, the specific detail, the client voice, the nuance of a situation that only comes from a human relationship with the organization being served. AI can rearrange the furniture. It cannot build the house.

As one writer observed, the anecdotal story that compels a funder to give—the specific quote from a program participant, the unexpected outcome that reveals something true about the work—requires a human professional who has had real conversations with real people inside real organizations. AI does not have those conversations.

Connecting the Dots: Contextual Intelligence

One of the most insightful observations from our team was less about storytelling and more about synthesis. The ability to connect seemingly disparate ideas—to see how a funder’s strategic priorities, an organization’s theory of change, a community’s documented need, and a program model all fit together into a compelling argument—requires a kind of associative, contextual intelligence that AI does not currently replicate with consistency.

This is not about generating text. It is about seeing the through-line that makes a proposal coherent and persuasive. Experienced grant writers develop this capacity over years of practice. It is pattern recognition informed by deep sector knowledge, and it is precisely this capacity that produces proposals that feel alive rather than assembled.

“There are intentional nuances in language, tone, and messaging that AI cannot fully replicate. Every word is intentionally chosen to reflect the organization’s mission, impact, and to communicate a compelling case for support to funders.”

Organizational Knowledge and Voice

Professional grant writers develop deep familiarity with their clients’ language, values, history, and relationships. This institutional knowledge shapes every sentence of a proposal—and it cannot be uploaded to a chatbot.

This is particularly significant for P2G writers who serve long-term clients. They know branded language, organizational history, key program outcomes, and the specific way a particular funder has responded to this client in the past. AI has access to none of this without explicit instruction—and even then, it cannot replicate the judgment that comes from years of relationship.

Funder Intelligence: Knowing How They Think

Grant writing does not end with submission. This point was recently raised directly by a respected leader in the funder community: the grant relationship extends through follow-up, stewardship, and ongoing communication. Understanding how funders think—what motivates their board members, what their program officers value, what kinds of outcomes they celebrate, and what their unstated priorities are—is intelligence that can only be built through relationship over time.

AI can now help research individual board members, program officers, and foundation leadership in ways that were previously time-prohibitive. Reviewing 990s, public statements, giving histories, and LinkedIn profiles to develop a richer picture of who is making funding decisions is an area where AI genuinely extends the grant professional's research capacity. But the relationship intelligence that determines how to use that information—the judgment about what to say, when to say it, and how to frame it for this particular funder—remains human.

The Relationship Factor: What the Data Shows

Research from Grant Consulting Services LLC found that when pre-existing relationships existed between applicants and funders, grant success rates improved. In one analysis, 59% of applications submitted with no prior relationship were subsequently denied—while applications with existing relationships showed significantly stronger outcomes. Research consistently shows that trust, clarity, and continuity are central to philanthropic decision-making, especially when funders are choosing between multiple qualified organizations.

Strategic Judgment and Grant Strategist Skills

The shift from “grant writer” to “grant strategist” is emerging as the most significant professional evolution in this field. What does a grant strategist need that a grant writer may not have developed?

- Deep sector knowledge across multiple issue areas and funding environments
- Funder relationship intelligence—understanding how specific funders think and decide
- Organizational assessment capacity—knowing which clients are grant-ready and which are not
- Portfolio strategy—managing a diverse funder mix to reduce dependence risk
- AI literacy—the ability to direct, evaluate, and quality-control AI output
- Follow-up and stewardship expertise—maintaining funder relationships between submission cycles
- Prompt engineering skill—crafting the right instructions to get quality AI output

These are not skills that AI develops. They are skills that experienced human professionals bring to the work—and we believe they are precisely the skills that will determine who thrives in the next chapter of this profession.

A Note on Research Objectivity

A thoughtful reader might ask: are these practitioners' assessments of AI influenced by a natural desire to protect their professional roles? It is a legitimate question, and it deserves a direct answer.

Yes, professional self-interest is a real dynamic in any workforce assessment of automation. The broader research literature confirms that fear of job displacement is one of the most common concerns about AI across industries. We would be naive to claim our writers are entirely free of that concern.

However, several factors give us confidence that our findings reflect genuine professional observation rather than motivated reasoning. First, our writers acknowledged areas where AI is genuinely helpful—even where that help reduces the time they spend on certain tasks. Second, several respondents identified ways in which AI capabilities have surprised or exceeded their initial expectations. Third, the specific, consistent, and detailed nature of the observations about AI's limits—particularly around contextual intelligence, funder relationship knowledge, and organizational voice—are corroborated by external research on AI writing capabilities.

We present these findings as honest professional assessment, not advocacy. The limits we identify are real. They are also evolving. Organizations and professionals who monitor that evolution with clear eyes will be best positioned to navigate it.

Section 4: The Ethics and Funder Landscape

Perhaps no dimension of AI in grant writing generates more uncertainty than the question of ethics and funder perception. Our research reveals a landscape in rapid evolution—and a professional community thinking carefully about its responsibilities.

Can Funders Detect AI-Written Proposals?

Views among our team were nuanced. The broad consensus: yes, sophisticated funders reviewing significant volume can likely detect proposals written primarily by AI. The tell-tale signs mentioned included generic language, shifts in tone, lack of organizational specificity, and the absence of the nuance that comes from knowing a client deeply.

However, the picture is more complex than simple detection.

Some Funders Are Actively Encouraging AI Use

Multiple respondents noted that funders like the Community Foundation of Tampa Bay are not only permitting AI assistance—they are encouraging it for specific tasks and explicitly asking applicants to disclose how AI was used in the proposal process.

“Funders such as the Community Foundation of Tampa Bay openly suggest using AI, albeit carefully so it reflects the nonprofit.”

The Concern Is About Wholesale AI Writing, Not AI Assistance

The concern shared by most respondents was not about using AI to research, organize, or refine. It was about using AI to write the proposal itself without meaningful human authorship.

“Possibly, if it is used to write entire proposals. If used to simply assist in streamlining, it should be fine.”

The Ethics of Professional Responsibility

“I think it is unethical to use AI to write proposals if you are getting paid to write. Clients could just do that themselves; they are paying you to do something for them with a human touch.”

This perspective articulates something important that applies beyond individual practitioners: nonprofit organizations hiring grant professionals are not paying for a word count. They are paying for expertise, judgment, relationship, and craft. AI cannot fulfill that professional obligation on its own.

The broader consensus among our team: AI assistance is appropriate and increasingly expected—but the professional grant writer must remain the author, strategist, and quality-control standard. Transparency with clients and funders about how AI is used is not just good practice—it is an emerging professional norm.

A Note on Funder Relationship Services and Florida Law

One important boundary that shapes P2G’s service model: under Florida law, organizations that provide services to help nonprofits cultivate and build relationships with funders—including strategic funder engagement—may be required to register as professional solicitors and submit contracts to the state. This regulatory framework shapes how grant writing firms can appropriately serve clients in Florida.

This does not diminish the importance of funder relationships—quite the opposite. It underscores that relationship development is serious, regulated work that requires expertise, ethics, and professional accountability. Nonprofits navigating this dimension of fundraising are well-served by working with partners who understand both the strategic and regulatory landscape.

Section 5: Policy, Leadership, and the Road Ahead

Our research asked not just how AI is being used, but how organizations can lead well in this environment. The responses point to clear principles for nonprofit executives and board members navigating this transition.

The Role of Organizational Policy

P2G has developed an explicit AI use policy for our team—and the survey results suggest it is serving its intended function. Writers described consulting it regularly, including when responding to funder questions about AI disclosure.

“I consult P2G’s policy frequently, in my own work and when responding to a funder’s question about how I have used AI. I use company language to guide my work.”

What Nonprofit Leaders Need to Know

Drawing from the “biggest misconceptions” responses and the broader dataset, here is what our team most wants nonprofit leaders to understand:

Misconception #1: AI Can Write a Grant for You

It cannot—not a competitive one. AI can produce text. It cannot produce a funded proposal without the organizational knowledge, strategic judgment, funder relationship intelligence, and narrative craft of a skilled human professional. Nonprofits that attempt to use AI as a replacement for professional grant writing will likely produce generic, uncompetitive proposals.

“AI is not a grant writer. It’s a grant writing assistant.”

Misconception #2: Not Using AI Is Principled

One of the most striking observations from our survey challenged the assumption that refusing AI is morally superior:

“Don’t be afraid of it. It CAN help. Not using it isn’t a moral high ground. It’s making things more efficient, and the goal is to get the nonprofits money.”

For nonprofit organizations, this is a call to pragmatism. Resistance to AI grounded in discomfort rather than principle is not serving your mission.

Misconception #3: AI Will Replace Grant Writers

The opposite of Misconception #1—and equally unfounded. Our team is unified: AI will change the profession, but it will not eliminate it. What is already changing is who gets displaced and who advances.

The data from the broader writing workforce is instructive and sobering. Entry-level writing roles are the most vulnerable: research suggests that 27% of entry-level writing positions and 35% of freelance gigs have declined since 2023 due to AI. The professional grant writers at risk are those doing commodity-level work—churning out generic proposals without deep client relationships or sector expertise. Job loss is a real possibility in grant writing for professionals whose value is primarily in their ability to produce text rather than their judgment, relationships, and strategy. This is not a comfortable observation, but it is an honest one.

The grant writers who will thrive are those who evolve into grant strategists: professionals whose value lies in expertise, funder relationships, organizational assessment, and the ability to direct AI intelligently rather than compete with it.

“The role of a grant writer will change, undoubtedly, but that is true of many fields, from teachers to lawyers.”

Misconception #4: AI Dramatically Reduces Time Requirements

One of our most experienced writers offered the most candid pushback on the efficiency promise:

“It isn’t as time-saving as many may believe. Especially not a blanket time-saver. The writer still needs to be on top of providing it current information, and do a lot of revising.”

The reason this matters is practical: AI requires skilled direction, verification, and revision. The net time saved varies significantly by task, writer experience, and use case. Nonprofits should not reduce grant writing budgets based on an assumption that AI dramatically reduces the time required for quality work.

What AI may do, in the hands of a skilled professional, is allow a higher quality output in the same time—not the same quality output in dramatically less time. That distinction matters.

Implications for Nonprofit Organizations

1. Invest in Skilled, Experienced Human Grant Expertise

AI is a tool in the hands of a skilled professional, not a substitute for one. The best outcomes will come from organizations that invest in qualified grant writers with deep sector knowledge, strong funder relationships, and the experience to direct AI intelligently. The investment in human expertise is not made redundant by AI—it becomes more important.

2. Develop an AI Use Policy

Your grant writers, program staff, and communications team likely already use AI. A thoughtful policy—defining appropriate use, disclosure expectations, and quality standards—protects your organization, guides your team, and positions you well with funders who increasingly ask about your AI practices.

3. Stay Informed About Funder Expectations

The philanthropic sector's position on AI is evolving rapidly. Some funders explicitly encourage AI use. Others may penalize it. Your grant professional should be tracking funder-specific guidance and adjusting practice accordingly. This is a new dimension of funder relationship management.

4. Treat Funder Relationships as a Strategic Asset—Not an Administrative Task

Research consistently demonstrates that relationships can precede funding decisions at the most competitive levels. The organizations that build meaningful funder engagement between application cycles—sharing impact updates, attending sector events, maintaining honest communication—are the ones that convert first-time grants into long-term partnerships. AI can help research funders more deeply. It cannot build the relationship.

5. Build Verification Into Every AI-Assisted Process

If AI is used in your grant writing process, every factual claim, statistic, and organizational detail that AI generates must be independently verified. The risk of an inaccurate proposal is too significant to skip this step.

6. Prioritize Story, Relationship, and Strategy

These are the dimensions of grant writing that AI cannot yet provide—and they are also the dimensions most likely to determine whether a proposal succeeds. Organizations that invest in compelling impact stories, deep client relationships, and strategic funder engagement will have a durable competitive advantage that no AI tool can replicate.

Conclusion: The Future Is Human-Led and AI-Assisted

The most important thing our research revealed is not a data point. It is a posture.

The professional grant writers at Pathways to Growth are neither afraid of AI nor uncritical of it. They are using it where it helps, watching it where it errs, holding the line where it falls short, and continuing to develop the distinctly human skills that no algorithm will replace in any foreseeable future.

That posture—curious, disciplined, human-led—is the model we recommend for the nonprofit sector.

Grants and nonprofits exist at the heart of human life. They feed people. They heal communities. They protect children. They restore families. They give voice to those who have been silenced. The philanthropic impulse is not a transaction—it is a response to human need, expressed through human relationship and human trust.

AI can help surface data, organize language, and speed up certain tasks. But the proposal that wins a grant is the one that makes a funder feel the weight and worth of a cause—and that requires a human professional who carries the organization's story, knows the funder's values, and has the judgment to bring them together on the page.

“AI works best as a support tool for research, organizing ideas, and surfacing opportunities—not as a replacement for human judgment or narrative development. The nonprofits that get the most value from it use it intentionally and continue to own every key decision and sentence in a proposal.”

At Pathways to Growth, we are committed to staying at the leading edge of this conversation—not because technology is our mission, but because your mission is. And your mission deserves the best thinking, the most skilled writing, and the wisest use of every tool available.

Methodology Note

This white paper is based on a structured internal survey administered to the Pathways to Growth grant writing team in 2026. Ten professional grant writers completed the survey, representing a range of tenure, client sectors, AI adoption levels, and academic backgrounds.

The survey was organized into five thematic sections: AI usage patterns, quality and results, the human element, ethics and funder perceptions, and policy and the broader professional future. Questions included a mix of structured response items and open-ended narrative prompts. All responses were collected anonymously to encourage candor.

Quantitative findings are drawn from structured responses. Qualitative findings are synthesized from open-ended responses and representative quotes are cited throughout. No individual respondent is identified.

As a qualitative practitioner study, these findings are intended to be illustrative and directional rather than statistically generalizable. The value of the research lies in the depth and specificity of practitioner perspective from an experienced, specialized professional team.

External data cited in this paper draws from Giving USA 2025, Foundation Source's 2025 Report on Private Philanthropy, Candid's 2025 Foundation Giving Forecast, the Northwestern University Innovation Institute's 2026 analysis of AI in federal grant proposals, the Grant Professionals Association, the Department of Labor, and published sector research from Instrumentl, Grant Station, and the Center for Effective Philanthropy.