

A New Agenda for the Progressive Women's Movement

By Kiran Ahuja, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum

Reprinted from State of Philanthropy 2006: Creating Dialogue for Tomorrow's Movements

Published by NCRP in July 2006

As a young leader and a woman of color in the women's and reproductive rights movement, I was asked by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy to comment on the state of the progressive women's movement. Given my unique role as one of few young national leaders and women of color leaders heading a national women of color organization, I hope I can offer some helpful advice on how we can build a more vibrant and inclusive women's movement: a movement with adequate resources for our work, especially advocacy by and for underrepresented women in the movement (women of color, immigrant women, young women, queers, and disabled women); a movement that is embraced by the larger progressive movement and not sidelined; a movement that



Participants of the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum's 2006 conference held in September 2006 at the Loyola Marymount University in California.

develops a strong commitment to building new and young leadership; a movement committed to social justice feminism; and a movement that harnesses the energy and excitement of the March for Women's Lives.¹ *(continued on page 11)*

Photo by Jay Davis/Workshop Visuals Media

IN THIS EDITION

A New Agenda for the Progressive Women's Movement	1
EDITORIAL – Feminization of Philanthropy: Learning from the Women's Movement	2
SPOTLIGHT – Chris Grumm: Improving Lives through Women's Funds	4
Aid on Whose Terms? Challenges to Developing an Effective Response to Trafficking in Women	7

Feminization of Philanthropy: Learning from the Women's Movement

Thirty years ago, around the time when NCRP emerged as the brainchild of a coalition of nonprofit leaders and advocates, it was a very different world for women. The 1960s generation of American women led a movement to bring women to an equal footing in society. More women began working and gained a significant source of independent wealth and income. But the era was also marked by an emerging *feminization of poverty*¹—female-headed households increasingly accounted for a larger portion of low-income households. And globally, some women had yet to enjoy the right to vote, let alone an education. For the first time, development organizations recognized that their work to improve emerging economies was disproportionately affecting women, who had few property rights and were often coerced into household and work restrictions.²

The philanthropic world showed little interest at the time in addressing gender-specific issues related to poverty; with the absence of women funders, women's issues remained largely ignored. Thankfully, the larger

social issues in a way that was never done before. The Ms. Foundation, which emerged from this effort, began a movement that is leading philanthropy today through innovative and holistic poverty-alleviation models.

A recent Children's Defense Fund report³ states, "Perhaps the most effective way to ensure greater educational opportunities for girls and women is to engage a critical core of women and girls in all efforts to improve girls' and women's future." The past three decades are evidence of the truth in this philosophy. In the 1980s, women's foundations gained momentum, and in 1985 NCRP helped host the first National Conference of Women's Funds, out of which the Women's Funding Network was created. As women increasingly gained a voice in philanthropy, girls' and women's issues came to the fore of social change.

Since then, awareness of women's issues has greatly increased. Some large foundations now earmark funds for women's and girls' issues; U.S. development organizations are required by law to be gender sensitive in their work. Women enjoy a greater role in American society, where 41 percent of those reporting incomes of \$500,000 are women.⁴ Globally, barriers to girls' education are being addressed, and

micro-credit programs, such as the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh (whose founder, Muhammad Yunus, just won the Nobel Peace Prize), are helping women gain economic independence.

But funding programs that address women's and girls' issues does a lot more than just help women and girls. Funding women means funding communities:

"When common societal problems are considered by how they specifically affect women and girls, solutions to these problems differ from traditional approaches."

women's social movement emphasized the need for power, not just wealth, from the onset. Economic inequality and lack of decision-making power were identified early on as the root of gender inequity in societies. In 1972, the editors of *Ms. Magazine* decided to pool the newly granted wealth generated by women and channel it toward fighting poverty and

Responsive Philanthropy is the quarterly journal of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy

2006, Issue No. 4
Yearly subscription: \$25
(free to members)
ISBN: 1065-0008



NCRP STAFF

Ambreen Ali	Communications Associate
Andrea M. Parke	Director of Finance & Administration
Kevin Faria	Development Associate
Mary M. Lassen	Interim Executive Director
Kristina C. Moore	Communications Associate
Margaret Picard	Administrative Assistant



(L-R) Cindy Domingo, board member of the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF); Kavita Ramdas, president and CEO of the Global Fund for Women; Silvia Henriquez, executive director of the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, and Kiran Ahuja, national director of NAPAWF.

When women's education has been emphasized in societies, there has been a decline in child mortality, smaller and healthier families, fewer HIV outbreaks, greater emphasis on children's education, and a greater presence of women in the political process.⁵

Women's funds take pride in approaching poverty alleviation through nontraditional methods. They emerged partly from the 1974 Filer Commission report that criticized traditional philanthropy's inability to tackle women's issues (the same report, coincidentally, that triggered the creation of NCRP). "When common societal problems are considered by how they specifically affect women and girls, solutions to these problems differ from traditional approaches," the Women's Funding Network explains.

Women's funds emphasize a community-style relationship among funds, donors, organizations, and the women and girls served. Funders are often more engaged in the work being done on the ground than is the case in traditional philanthropy. Women's funds also focus on community-based approaches that provide holistic methods to alleviating poverty.

The impact of these innovative solutions on philanthropy is evidenced by the funds' role in important issues as diverse as education and disaster relief. The Ms. Foundation created a Take Our Daughter to Work Day, a public education campaign that aims to engage children to discuss the continuing disparities between genders in the workplace. The Women's Funding Network used its global reach to emphasize the relationships between the global and national aspects of issues such as sex trafficking. And when Hurricane Katrina hit the Gulf Coast last year, these two organizations united to provide disaster relief through an integrated approach to housing, child care, employment,

health and safety. The result was a successful program that recognized the intricate relationships among these diverse social issues, all of which stemmed from an underlying problem: poverty.

In this issue, we explore this unique sector of philanthropy and its important role in creating social change, and seek to gain from it valuable lessons that will help us all fulfill our missions to help those in need. Kiran Ahuja, national director of the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, addresses the need for a new women's movement relevant to today's issues. Norma Timbang investigates the funding sources used to help victims of human trafficking, looking carefully at the motives of such funders. And Chris Grumm, president of the Women's Funding Network, shares with NCRP the accomplishments, challenges, and vision of today's leaders in women's funding.

The women's funding movement has taught philanthropy valuable lessons. We have seen how new approaches to the same problems can help us be more effective. And we have learned the importance of providing comprehensive solutions to prevent negative side effects in the programs we implement to empower communities. But sadly, despite evidence pointing to their effectiveness, only 6.4 percent of philanthropic dollars was earmarked for programs for women and girls just five years ago.⁶ Women philanthropists have been the main funders of women's issues for far too long.

Even today, women continue to "do 66 percent of the work in the world, produce 50 percent of the food, but earn 5 percent of income and 1 percent of the property."⁷ There is clearly a lot of work ahead, for *all* of us.

This editorial was written by Ambreen Ali, communications associate at the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.

NOTES

1. The term was coined by Diana Pearce in 1978. She was a visiting researcher at the University of Wisconsin who published a paper noting that poverty was becoming "feminized" in the United States. According to Pearce, almost two-thirds of the poor over age 16 were women.
2. Nilüfer Çagatay, "Engendering Macroeconomics and Macroeconomic Policies," United Nations Development Programme, Social Development and Poverty Elimination Division (October 1998).
3. Ecaterina Marshall, "Promoting Girls' Education: Where Do We Stand and How Do We Move Forward?" Children's Defense Fund, (2006).
4. Toddi Gutner, "Philanthropy with a Woman's Touch," *BusinessWeek* (October 30, 2000).
5. Ecaterina Marshall, "Promoting Girls' Education: Where Do We Stand and How Do We Move Forward?" Children's Defense Fund, (2006).
6. Molly Mead, "Gender Matters: Funding Effective Programs for Women and Girls," Tufts University (June 2001).
7. Patrick Healy, "Hillary Clinton Stars at Husband's Meeting on World's Ills," *New York Times* (September 23, 2006).

Chris Grumm: Improving Lives through Women's Funds

By Kelly Schultz, NCRP

Chris Grumm, president and chief executive officer of the Women's Funding Network (WFN), has been credited with supporting its member funds in a massive expansion plan that raised the assets of women's and girls' foundations from \$180 million to over \$400 million. WFN, through its member funds, invests in and advances various programs that seek to improve the circumstances of women and girls—tackling such interrelated problems as housing, child care, employment, health, and safety—through local, national, and international grants.

Last year, WFN partnered with the Ms. Foundation for Women in a \$1.3 million Hurricane Katrina project, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The money was invested in community-based organizations in the Gulf Coast and other areas.

Chris Grumm sat down with NCRP to discuss WFN's successes and challenges and the issues facing women today.

NCRP: What is the place of the Women's Funding Network in the women's funding movement?

CG: I think the Women's Funding Network plays a key role and, in some ways, a central role [to the overall women's movement]. It's an organized way to bring together women's funds with donor and with grantee leaders.

We are both a network, and we are helping to build a movement. There are not a lot of organizations that fit into both roles. We are creating more effective tools thereby supporting greater effectiveness among our member funds. The increased capacities are, in turn, rippling outward to women's organizations that receive grants and capacity-building support from our members. Together with our members, we have increased the amount of philanthropy going to women's and girls' pro-



*Chris Grumm, President and CEO of the
Women's Funding Network*

grams, which increases their ability to create social change in their local communities.

NCRP: Under your leadership, the Women's Funding Network has seen tremendous growth in membership and assets. To what would you credit this success?

CG: Women's funds see themselves as playing a critical role in community change. I think growth has come from the success of this model that, one, everyone can be a philanthropist; two, funds support on-the-ground leadership who understand solution building; three, women are relational givers and give more and

longer when a community is part of the equation; and four, social change philanthropy is about making a difference and women need to be at the table for that difference to be sustainable.

We've seen growth of women's funds because we've seen growth of wealth among women. Women donors are looking not just to write a check but to be a part of, and to make a difference in, their community. It's a critical aspect of their philanthropy.

NCRP: You claim that "Women's and girls' funds have traditionally been ahead of the curve in testing and defining programs and policies that improve the lives of women and girls." How is the Women's Funding Network thinking ahead of the curve today when it comes to women's issues?

CG: We are made up of 115 women's funds from around the world, and what happens is women's funds are hearing firsthand from grantees and donors regarding issues most impacting their lives. Women's funds provide the leadership to bring grantees and donors together, address emerging issues, alert to changing trends and craft sustainable solutions. This puts them at the forefront of the social change movement.

NCRP: Over the past decades, the issues affecting women and girls have changed significantly in some ways, yet remained fundamentally the same in others. How have the issues changed, and in what way have they remained the same?

CG: Poverty, poverty, and more poverty. [The issue] has remained the same. Some women have been able to move out of poverty. Women have moved into new job markets, become CEOs and more wealth is in the name of women than ever before. Look at the millions of women who have started their own business through the help of grants that gave access to loans and trainings. They are creating new income streams and new jobs. In this way you see change.

But we have not seen change in the lowest income level, and part of that is because we haven't had the policies in place to bring about that change. Women and children make up 70 percent of those in poverty. Until that percentage drops, we continue to only treat the symptoms.

NCRP: What can the broader sector of philanthropy learn from women's funds?

CG: We define philanthropy by people with the willingness to make a difference, not by the amount of money people give. When you bring together the people regardless of race or class who come with on-the-ground solutions with financial resources and with a sense of community, you can make a difference that explodes across sectors around the globe.

I think the fact that women's funds are on a growth trajectory—even when the economy was going down, women's funds were able to maintain and in some ways grow. That is because those involved in women's funds experience community and that creates loyalty, which means regardless of the state of the economy or the world, we stand together to make a difference.

NCRP: What program areas distinguish the work of your members?

CG: Many of the people we work with are talented and gifted leaders from their communities. We focus on empowering leaders within our own community using a woman's perspective. Educate a woman and you educate a family. Give a woman health care and you give a family health care. Give a woman economic security and a family has economic security. Women are our entry point in making a difference in a community.

NCRP: How would you describe your donor base?

CG: It is a very loyal donor base. It has breadth and depth of as many donors as there are communities across

Everyone can be a philanthropist... Our donor base spans the economic classes, and it is a base filled with people who want to make a difference.

the world. There are thousands of donors who give to women's funds around the world. Predominantly women give, but also men who want to make a difference in the world contribute to the women's funding movement.

Many of the donors have been supporting this kind of work for years. At the Women's Funding Network, we say that everyone can be a philanthropist, with people who give from \$10 to multimillions. Our donor base spans the economic classes, and it is a base filled with people who want to make a difference.

NCRP: From a funder's perspective, what is the greatest challenge you face in implementing initiatives and achieving your objectives?

CG: We have a really good idea of what works on the ground and can make a difference. There just isn't the amount of resources available to do work in the magnitude that is needed.

One of the biggest challenges for anybody working in social change is how do you quantify, evaluate, and know



Low-income working parents and their children from Parent Voices, a project of the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network and a grant partner of the Women's Foundation of California.

you made a difference? Therefore we have developed a tool called "Making the Case." It measures that impact of social change and allows our movement to track our work, especially results and return on investment.

NCRP: What do you think one of the Women's Funding Network's greatest successes has been?

CG: One of our really exciting successes is a program called Women of Color/International Development Incubator (WOCIDI). It's a training program made up of women of color and international women who come together to learn from each other the skills and tools for development and fundraising.

Over the last three years, 45 women have come through the program and together have raised \$24 million. When they started, many women had no interest and did not think they could be successful fundraisers, but it has been a wonderful opportunity to see how women can come together, share wisdom, lead, and be successful fundraisers.

NCRP: Can you give an example where you felt like real progress was made toward social change?

CG: The women's funds were extremely effective in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Our Katrina project, funded by Kellogg through the Ms. Foundation, along with the Women's Funding Network and five of our member funds, gave grants that created and developed exceptional programs for evacuees and women from the Gulf Coast.

Women's funds addressed the issue of a disaster from the point of view of women. You cannot use a single-issue approach. If you want sustainable change, you have to use a holistic approach: You have to provide job training, child care, schools that are safe, mental health care, and they need legal aid for those [with] houses going under foreclosure and for all other legal issues.

All of these things cannot be provided piecemeal. We found that in the grants that were made through the Katrina Fund, that holistic approach really allowed people to make a change and feel more secure in the communities they were living in.

Women from [our] local communities supported women from the Gulf Coast to speak out in Washington about issues impacting their families and the lack of funding available to implement solutions on the ground. The willingness to trust women's leadership on the ground gave them the resources to let their leadership be really effective.

NCRP: What is your vision for 20 years from now?

CG: Twenty years from now, I hope there is no need for women's funds because communities would support women, their leadership and their work. But, as a realist, my vision is that women's funds are the major distributors of billions of dollars in grants and with those resources, the course of the world is changed where everyone has the opportunity to experience economic security, freedom from violence, access to health care and environmental sustainability.

Kelly Schultz is a communications/development assistant at the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.

Aid on Whose Terms?

Challenges to Developing an Effective Response to Trafficking in Women

By Norma Timbang

The recent upsurge of human trafficking¹ suggests an urgent need for nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and government agencies in the United States to increase their ability to assist people who have been liberated from the traffickers.

The State Department's 2004 *Trafficking in Persons Report* estimates that 600,000 to 800,000 persons are trafficked around the world. Of the victimized, 80 percent are female.² Human traffickers frequently target the most economically devastated areas—mostly in least-developed countries—where women face unequal access to education and employment opportunities. Traffickers earn approximately \$9 billion per year, profiting primarily from forced labor and slavery in places such as brothels, homes, farms, and sweatshops. Unfortunately, trafficking of human beings is not just happening in less-developed countries. The U.S. Department of Justice estimates that 14,000 to 17,500 people are trafficked into the United States annually.³

The Prevalent Response and their Impacts

In the United States, anti-trafficking efforts primarily focus on sex labor and are used as an opportunity to promote conservative moral and religious values. Regrettably, this conservative approach de-emphasizes self-determination, which has a demoralizing effect on the victims, while amplifying the stigma of sex trafficking and increasing the perception that trafficked persons often have no choice but to remain in sex slavery.

The conservative approach that has been espoused by the U.S. government also limits the ability of government-funded organizations to run effective programs to assist victims of trafficking. For example, Chris Smith (R-N.J.), co-chair of the House Pro-Life Caucus, advocated for legislation that resulted in provisions prohibiting U.S. government-funded NGOs from discussing abortion and prostitution when speaking with survivors.⁴

In June 2005, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) issued a policy directive to NGOs receiving USAID funding—both foreign and domestic—instructing recipient groups to “not endorse or utilize a multisectoral approach to combatting HIV/AIDS, or to not endorse, utilize or participate in a prevention method or treatment program to which the organization has a religious or moral objection ... require recipients to agree that they oppose prostitution and trafficking.”⁵

Requiring NGOs to publicly state that they are against prostitution fails to acknowledge that many people who might need the groups' services have no choice but to work in prostitution in order feed their families and survive.

In 2006, the U.S. government provided funding to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), through the Office of Refugee Resettlement, to administer “per capita victim services” funding to U.S. service providers. In order to access the funds, recipients must sign a statement certifying that “funds shall not be used to provide referral for abortion services or contraceptive mate-

[Programs] must contribute to social change and develop responses that honor the dignity of trafficked persons and those vulnerable to human trafficking.

rials, pursuant to this contract.” There are no provisions in the contracts for consideration of abortion in instances of rape, incest, or life-saving surgery. Additionally, if victims of sex trafficking being assisted by the grantee are revictimized, they will not have access to life-saving education regarding contraceptive methods, such as condom use.

This USCCB directive is similar to the controversial “global gag rule,” which prohibits discussions of abortion by foreign NGOs receiving U.S. funding. The “global gag rule” restricts freedom of speech, prevents open debate on abortion, and would be deemed

unconstitutional if implemented in the United States.⁶ The USCCB, although not a government entity, sends a clear message that public denouncement of abortion is sanctioned by the U.S. government.

The sensationalization in the media and entertainment industry⁷ of trafficking for purposes of prostitution and sexual labor contributes to the skewed perspective of trafficked persons as passive victims. It also

to respond to the needs of their new constituency and develop protocols for delivering services. Many of these CBOs are also involved in assisting survivors of domestic violence and follow traditional practices of survivor-centered approaches, including advocating for support both of the survivors' self-determination and empowerment. CBOs serving survivors of trafficking have adapted similar approaches

centered on advocating for the rights of the survivors to determine their own next steps, while also providing the survivors with information and

The U.S. Department of Justice estimates that 14,000 to 17,500 people are trafficked into the United States annually.

promotes the stereotyping of these victims as primarily sexual slaves and neglects to recognize trafficking for purposes of other labor.⁸ A 2004 study estimated that less than half of human trafficking cases in the United States were related to prostitution. Domestic workers, agricultural workers, and sweatshops represent the second-, third-, and fourth-largest groups of persons, respectively, that are trafficked into the United States.⁹ Understanding the many forms of human trafficking will further highlight the root causes of trafficking: the need for forced labor and the impact of globalization on the economic survival of families and individuals in less-developed nations.

An Alternative Approach

Community-based organizations (CBOs) must have the resources to implement grassroots organizing strategies that encourage communities to accept trafficking survivors and promote broad understanding of the multiple challenges that victims face. Programs must have progressive analyses that take into consideration the economic roots of human trafficking. They must contribute to social change and develop responses that honor the dignity of trafficked persons and those vulnerable to human trafficking.

In the United States, as a result of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 new resources were made available for CBOs that had been providing unfunded services to survivors of trafficking. Additionally, organizations that did not previously serve victims of human trafficking were able to access these funds to increase their capacity

resources to facilitate safer choices (e.g., using condoms and pursuing work that will not require putting them in harms way).

These challenges are compounded by the reality that many survivors will likely go back to sexual labor and face revictimization. Fear of physical harm to themselves and their family members is the most overwhelming reason for returning to sexual labor. Other reasons for this seemingly illogical trend is the victims' distrust of service providers, immigration services, law enforcement, criminal justice systems, and others with whom they might come into contact postliberation. Lack of culturally relevant and safe social networks, fear of stigma and ostracization from the victims' ethnic communities—especially if returned to their country of origin—and lack of knowledge regarding available resources can also be barriers that lead to revictimization.

To gain victims' trust, those assisting them need to understand the victims' multiple levels of vulnerability, cultural and spiritual differences, and experiences tied to race, gender, and class. This can further the trafficking survivors' efforts toward self-determination and help them locate supportive social networks. CBO staffing and services must include training on and development of culturally relevant protocols for service provision as well as representation from diverse ethnic communities and languages or dialects. Above all, staff and people from potentially supportive social networks must have opportunities to enhance their ability to support survivors without judgment and without patronizing, while providing

validation and encouragement. In the best of all worlds, survivors will have opportunities to become grassroots organizers as well as service providers themselves.

Funding Self-determination: Survivors and Community-Based Organizations

Progressive efforts to combat human trafficking need additional support from the philanthropic community to develop no-strings-attached, comprehensive approaches to assisting victims and preventing revictimization.

Funders should consider the following:

- > Provide resources and technical assistance that are survivor-centered and incorporate survivor's inputs;
- > Develop and fund research initiatives on human trafficking that include needs assessments and program

evaluations, as well as provide the appropriate resources to projects to ensure their effectiveness;

- > Establish criteria on culturally relevant services and grassroots organizing that are clearly outlined in the requests for proposals and program monitoring processes;
- > Establish funding priorities that incorporate critical analyses of the race, gender, and class aspects of human trafficking; and,
- > Challenge discourse and policies that reinforce conservative agendas and prioritize morality of the conservative right over human dignity.

Human trafficking is one of the worst violations of civil and labor rights, as well as the basic human right to a life free from exploitation and violence. Response systems to survivors of human trafficking should not be guided by the values of the conservative right—at its

Trafficking of Persons, Especially Women and Children: USA Routes



Source: The Protection Project

root, human trafficking is an issue of human rights, social justice, social change, and liberation.

Norma Timbang is a cross cultural program development and evaluation consultant with 15 years experience working with survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking. She is at-large board member and chair of the Program Committee at the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum.

NOTES

1. Human trafficking, one of the largest criminal activities in the world (together with the illegal arms and drug trades), is a form of acquiring persons for cheap labor and slavery. It includes recruitment, commodification, harboring, transporting, and receipt of people for forced labor through the use of threats, violence, coercion, deception, fraud, and other forms of abuse. Persons victimized by trafficking are subject to debt bondage, indebted servitude, and restriction of freedoms.
2. Trafficking in Persons Report, U.S. State Department (2004).
3. Attorney General's Annual Report to Congress on U.S. Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons Fiscal Year 2005, U.S. Department of Justice (June 2006), <http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/annualreports/tr2005/agreporthu-mantrafficking2005.pdf>.
4. Debbie Nathan, "Oversexed," *The Nation* (August 29, 2005), <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20050829/nathan>.
5. "Implementation of the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act of 2003 – Eligibility Limitation on the Use of Funds and Opposition to Prostitution and Sex Trafficking," U.S. Agency for International Development (June 9, 2005), http://www.usaid.gov/business/business_opportunities/cib/pdf/aapd05_04.pdf.
6. "How the Global Gag Rule Undermines U.S. Foreign Policy and Harms Women's Health," Population Action International, http://www.populationaction.org/resources/factsheets/FS5_GG_R_final.pdf.
7. e.g., *Lifetime* miniseries: Human Trafficking.
8. Raina Kapur, "Cross-border Movements and the Law: Renegotiating the Boundaries of Difference," *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights*, pp 30-31, Paradigm Publishers, London (2005).
9. "Hidden Slaves: Forced Labor in the United States," Human Rights Center, University of California, Berkeley and Free the Slaves (2004), http://freetheslaves.net/files/Hidden_Slaves.pdf.

Resource Generation, in partnership with NCRP, presents...

Creating Change Through Family Philanthropy: The Next Generation

By Alison Goldberg, Karen Pittelman & Resource Generation

Soft Skull Press, 2007 \$24.95

Many families are looking for ways to engage the "next generation" in philanthropy. But for next generation members, getting involved raises complicated questions. How can they bring their values to the table? How can they move more resources to social justice? *Creating Change Through Family Philanthropy* gives young people the tools they need to not just participate but help transform the field itself. Complete with personal stories and exercises, this guide is also an essential resource for anyone who works with families with wealth.

ALSO AVAILABLE:

Classified: How To Stop Hiding Your Privilege and Use It For Social Change

By Karen Pittelman & Resource Generation
Illustrations by Molly Hein

For more information
and to order books, visit
www.changephilanthropy.org



Resource Generation
www.resourcegeneration.org
info@resourcegeneration.org

Building new Strategies for the Women's Movement

(continued from page 1)

For the past three years, I have been the executive director of the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF). Founded in 1996 by 157 Asian Pacific American (APA) female activists, NAPAWF is the only national, multi-issue advocacy organization for APA women and girls. Our staff is

women's movement. A recent report by the Center for the Advancement of Women, *Progress and Perils: A New Agenda for Women*, noted that few women belong to women's organizations and that minority women—specifically African American (63 percent) and Hispanics (68 percent)] had a stronger desire for a

Young people relate to leaders from *their* generation and *their* background and if we want to engage young and diverse women, then we need to have their faces in leadership positions.

women's movement than Caucasian women (41 percent).³ These statistics highlight the awkward juxtaposition of a sputtering women's movement and a growing, potent constituency who crave a movement that puts them at the center.

small, all under the age of 35, and all new to the women's movement. Our membership and chapters are growing, with women mostly under the age of 30 and new to the women's movement as well. Our mission is to elevate the voices of APA women and girls and develop young and new leadership within and outside our organization. Because we are young and seek to include APA women in the movement, we believe our work and that of our allies are crucial to the progressive women's movement.²

The lack of diverse leadership in the movement lies partly with the absence of strong and well-resourced women of color organizations. Though NAPAWF was founded in 1996, following the United Nation's World Conference on Women in 1995 in Beijing, we functioned basically as an all-volunteer organization until 2003. As the number of women of color program officers and leadership increase at foundations and as foundations see the merit of supporting women of color organizations, the rise of women of color and young women of color leadership will be increasingly evident.

Valuing and Developing Young, Diverse Leadership

In meetings I attend, seasoned women leaders often emphasize how many years they have been "in the movement." As a rite of passage or precursor to an important statement or opinion, time served has become a badge of honor in the movement. Indeed, as a young leader I understand that length of time stands for depth of conviction, expertise, commitment and, hopefully, even wisdom.

Indeed, with the rise of women of color organizations, an interesting phenomenon is taking place. Several of the newer organizations are led by young women, including NAPAWF, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, Refugee Women's Network and Sisters on the Rise. In NAPAWF's case, though our founding sisters are now in their 40s and 50s, they consciously stepped back and created space that allowed for young leadership within the national office and among our chapters' leadership. Because APA women were simply fighting for space and voice within the women's movement, there was little fighting among ourselves for position, power, and recognition. The founding sisters guide with a light hand, stepping in when their influence and experience are needed and making themselves available as friends and mentors, but most importantly, deferring leadership to younger NAPAWF sisters. Policy and advocacy initiatives at the NAPAWF chapter level inform and influence our national policy agenda.

At 35, I cannot claim to be a young leader. I am positive my more youthful sisters would balk at the idea of a 35-year-old being called "young," but that is a statement alone about the progressive women's movement: The movement and our ideas are maturing. That I am one of the youngest leaders in the national women's movement is telling and highlights a serious challenge for the movement—where and when do we make room for new, young and diverse leaders, and when do we see that the inclusion of them determines the success of our movement?

Developing young and diverse leadership remains one of the foremost challenges for the progressive

But starting new organizations should not be the only way to build young and diverse leadership. We

have to look within our organizations to see how and whether we are genuinely cultivating leadership. What training do young people in our organizations receive? Are they allowed to present and speak for the organization? Are they given substantive work and meaningful mentorship? And now the more difficult question: Does an executive director or top leadership have a succession plan to allow for new and young leadership? There are mantras in the movement that ask, where are all the young people, and how do we sustain a movement without “fresh blood?” My question is, where are all the young and new leaders? Young people relate to leaders from *their* generation and *their* background and if we want to engage young and diverse women, then we need to have their faces in leadership positions. All too often organizations become identified by the executive director and not the contributions of the organization or members. A movement loses steam if leaders become entrenched in their organizations and their positions, and if an organization becomes synonymous with the same leaders for long periods of time.

Organizations and leaders are taking other approaches to develop young and diverse leadership beyond their own organizations. The Young Women’s Collaborative (YWC) — composed of organizations run by young leaders—has created a unique leadership development program.⁴ Young leaders from ages 18 to 35 are provided with skills and issues trainings, support to develop or maintain regional campaigns, a broad framework to engage in reproductive rights/health/justice issues, and a diverse community of leaders from which to learn and share. The first cohort of leaders is from the Southwest, and YWC hopes to expand the leadership program to other regions of the country.⁵ Because the March for Women’s Lives proved that broadening the language around reproductive choice/rights can engage hundreds of thousands of young people and people of color, the Young Women’s Collaborative promotes a vision of reproductive justice (a broad, comprehensive framework) with a commitment to leadership development and movement-building strategies.

Defining a Bold and Visionary Agenda

On every front we feel under attack as women’s organizations scramble to maintain the gains we achieved in prior decades. Republicans seek to erode this country’s social safety net with attacks on Medicaid, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Social Security. Our lawmakers pass tax cuts for the wealthy, starve the government of resources, expand our military budget to justify cuts to essential programs for the poor; they provide lukewarm support for the historic Violence Against Women Act, which has always garnered tremendous bi-partisan support, and engage in downright deceit and unethical political maneuvering to keep Plan B off pharmacy shelves. And the conservative forces make immigrants their enemies by passing a bill that would criminalize undocumented immigrants and anyone who assists them.

A number of progressive advocates and leaders have realized that rather than working in a climate hostile to core progressive values, and rather than fighting for piecemeal victories in Washington, D.C., that hardly improve the lives of our communities, we must step back and set forth a bold and visionary agenda to effect the kind of positive change we believe is necessary to uplift every individual in this country. In *Losing Well*,

We want women to be healthy, valued and free to make decisions that impact their bodies and lives. For the women’s movement, it is about reclaiming the value in *valuing* women.

Rachel Gragg and Deepak Bhargava of the Center for Community Change encourage progressives to give up the futile fight in Washington (at this point in our political history), take a chance that there will be major losses before tide-changing victories, and spend time articulating a world we envision rather than one we oppose, so our fight is universal, bold, inspiring, and principled. Our renewed vision would give us direction, strength and purpose; make us proactive versus reactive; and galvanize our constituencies.

We also realize that in order to galvanize our constituents we must set forth a renewed vision for the

progressive movement. As *Losing Well* prescribes, we must set forth a bold vision for the movement and be relentless in our efforts to achieve it. We desire universal health care; humane immigration policies that move toward family unification and permanent residency, safety, fair treatment of migrants and an honest

string budgets but accomplish a great deal. Imagine if they had more than one or two staff to build their base, to better influence policymakers, and to preserve or increase protections and opportunities for women and girls.

It became apparent that without movement building strategies to connect to those most oppressed and impoverished, our movement will sputter out again.

A New Women's Movement

Developing young and new leadership, articulating a bold vision for a new women's movement, and prioritizing movement building strategies, were key issues in a series of

assessment of the benefits immigrants bring to our country; better work/family laws and policies; fair, decent and *living* wages; a social safety net for the economically impoverished; protected rights and fair treatment of gays; and progressive environmental laws that foresee harms of over-consumption and place high value and priority on the earth and its inhabitants not the companies that run it. And we want women to be healthy, valued and free to make decisions that impact their bodies and lives. For the women's movement, it is about reclaiming the value in *valuing women*.

Some national women's and reproductive rights organizations are looking beyond the fruitless policy struggles in Washington, D.C., and are realizing the value of victories outside Washington, D.C. They have chosen to prioritize efforts around galvanizing their constituency to prepare for future battles. Indeed, these organizations realize the importance of not only building their base within the women's movement, but expanding it; that our ultimate power as a movement is based on our ability to reach new and emerging communities and inspiring them with a bold, progressive vision. Though these organizations continue to engage with policymakers, they are equally committed to training a new generation of advocates.

As well, there are numerous statewide and local coalitions and organizations in the women's movement that are under-resourced but are critical, long-term investments for the progressive movement. We should not continue to disproportionately support national women's and reproductive rights organizations at the expense of building infrastructure in various states around the country. There are committed women leaders across the country who work on shoe-

meetings by the New Women's Movement (NWM) Initiative. Barbara Phillips, former program officer at the Ford Foundation; Faye Wattleton, president of the Center for the Advancement of Women (Center); Sara Gould, president of the Ms. Foundation; Katherine Acey, president of the Astraea Foundation; and Monique Mehta, executive director of the Third Wave Foundation brought women leaders together from around the country for three retreats to gauge where we are in the movement, what our challenges are, and how we should do things differently and better. The Center's *Progress and Perils* served as the impetus: It reported that women are less engaged in women's issues and that reproductive health/abortion is not a top priority issue for women. The report led us to ask the following questions: What is the state of the progressive women's movement? Why are women not engaged in the issues we as leaders care about? Are we ignoring issues important to them? Do we need different strategies to engage them and revitalize our work?

Like most movements in this country, major foundations have sustained the organizations and leaders that followed. The women's movement is no different. Over the years, as organizations receive significant funding, the landscape changes. We care about the work, but we care more about the sustainability of our organizations. The NWM meetings were designed to challenge women leaders to think about the state of the movement, not their organization, and to think creatively about the best strategies, collaborations, and issues to galvanize women and men around the country.

The meetings also pose very real and crucial challenges to funders. First, women's funding takes up a

small slice of the philanthropic pie, and in most cases, this has already been carved out for more established, national women's organizations. Does investing in only these organizations sustain a healthy movement? What about organizations (new voices) that represent communities of color, immigrants, indigenous women, and regions and communities outside major urban centers? During these meetings, women leaders discussed their challenges with current funding strategies: support for programs rather than organizations; the need for grants geared toward sustainability; and the hope of funding new and local organizations. The NWM meetings also challenged funders to think about the work itself and what strategies will revitalize a new women's movement. It became apparent that without movement building strategies to connect to those most oppressed and impoverished, our movement will sputter out again.

The NWM meetings took place over two years, with more than 60 progressive leaders and funders (the third and final retreat was held in March 2006). We unpacked some of the history of the women's movement and the scars that went along with it—the lack of inclusion of women of color, indigenous women, lesbians, and young women. We challenged ourselves to think differently about what issues should be core issues of the women's movement such as health, education, security and religion. We noted that values have shifted from an emphasis on individual liberation in the 1970s to a decade where women focus on their families as well. We also talked strategy, particularly the importance of movement building, collaborations and renewed resources for the movement. Finally, these series of meetings culminated in a profound realization that our movement has shifted from a movement based solely on women's equality to a movement grounded in social justice—a term we coined "social justice feminism." Now, a small group of individuals from the NWM Initiative will synthesize all of the great ideas and hard work of these women leaders to begin to articulate our bold vision for a new women's movement and how we plan to support it, each other, and new and young voices in the movement.

Our Challenge

We face challenging times, but it is an opportune moment in history to reevaluate our work, our movement, our values, and how we choose to work with one another. The NWM meetings forced us to look not only at the state of the movement but to look inward to the kinds of values and principles that developed within our organizations, and whether those values build or burden the movement.

Similar to our work with funders within the NWM Initiative, I ask foundations that fund women's and reproductive rights organizations to seriously consider whether their support truly sustains organizations for the long haul and whether their support reaches new voices and communities. As important as it may be to show projected outcomes, we know that building relationships in emerging communities takes time, and that tangible results are not always readily apparent. Does your funding prioritize movement building strategies and expanding the base of participation

We face challenging times, but it is an opportune moment in history to reevaluate our work, our movement, our values, and how we choose to work with one another.

within the women's movement? It is natural for foundations to feel comfortable supporting older and more seasoned leaders and organizations, but to build a stronger, sustainable movement, foundations have to be willing to take chances on smaller organizations. To counter the growth of the conservative right, we have to rethink our strategy regarding the imbalance of funding for national organizations versus local/state organizations. Finally, there is still a need for national women of color organizations. Do we see their voices on the national level?

If we can move outside our organizations and foundations to think critically about how to resurrect the progressive women's movement, we will be able reap tremendous benefits for years to come. I realize that it is a fearful process to be critical of our movement, to make fundamental changes to our organizations, and to re-direct resources, but we must if our goal is to change the tides of events and policies that have devastated communities across this country. I often

We need your support to continue our work!

RENEW your membership or subscription to continue receiving *Responsive Philanthropy*

Our recent and popular publications:

- > *State of Philanthropy 2006: Creating Dialogue for Tomorrow's Movements*
- > *The Waltons and Wal-Mart: Self-Interested Philanthropy*
- > *Funding the Culture Wars: Philanthropy, Church and State*

Upcoming research and issues:

- > Substantive approaches to philanthropic accountability
- > The effect of bank mergers on social justice and community organizations
- > Role of philanthropy in rural America
- > Increasing core-operating support for nonprofits

Thank you for your past support of NCRP. We'd like to invite you to renew your membership with NCRP. Your continued support is paramount to NCRP's success, and we encourage you to renew today!

With the help of supporters and subscribers like you, NCRP is now celebrating its 30th year of operating as the nation's nonprofit philanthropic watchdog. Your support is essential for us to continue and build our agenda.

As you know, we're promoting social change and social justice, as well as transparency and accountability, in U.S. philanthropy. In 2007 we will continue our work in rural and corporate philanthropy.

Visit www.ncrp.org to renew or donate.

remind myself when I worry about funding for NAPAWF that it is not about me, it is not about the organization, it is about my community and so many other communities who struggle everyday. I believe we all feel the same way. Will you join me in this effort to achieve our ultimate dream of opportunity and prosperity for *all* women and girls?

Kiran Ahuja is the national director of NAPAWF.

NOTES

1. On April 25, 2004, the March for Women's Lives became the largest March in the history of Washington, DC. Organized by national women leaders, including several women of color leaders, the March name was changed from the March for Freedom of Choice to the March for Women's Lives to suggest a shift in thinking in the women's movement: that to be more inclusive of women and allies who have often felt removed from the national women's movement, the movement must embrace the multitude of health and social justice issues that impact women and their families.
2. We have faced similar challenges as other young organizations in building our infrastructure and programs. In addition, we face a more difficult challenge of dispelling the model minority myth of the APA community, that similar to other minority communities, there are unique challenges and needs in our community. Only recently, our community received its largest grant ever to a single organization committed to social justice. Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy heads the National Gender and Equity Campaign, a campaign to build the capacity, infrastructure and skills of community-based APA organizations. They are supported by the Ford Foundation and seek to leverage the Ford grant to raise an unprecedented amount of philanthropic capital in our community's history.
3. APA women were polled in the general survey, but a sample was not large enough to make statistical interpretations of the group.
4. NAPAWF is a part of the Young Women's Collaborative, as are Choice USA, the Third Wave Foundation, and the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health. The YWC was a specific strategy developed following the March for Women's Lives.
5. The Southwest was chosen as our first region because of the tremendous growth among minority communities, particularly the Latino community, the rising wave of anti-immigrant sentiment and increased border security, and a region of the country often overlooked by the women's movement that can provide valuable lessons regarding tactics of the conservative right and creative mobilizing efforts among the immigrant and Native American communities.

New from NCRP

State of Philanthropy 2006: Creating Dialogue for Tomorrow's Movements (July 2006)

NCRP's third in a series of biennial collections, *State of Philanthropy 2006* aims to initiate conversations about creating progressive social change and increasing foundation accountability. It confronts contentious issues faced by today's nonprofit and philanthropic sectors from a variety of perspectives.

By addressing new foundation strategies, the impact of federal budget constraints on nonprofits, accountability legislation and regulations, and emerging progressive movements, *State of Philanthropy 2006* promotes the strengthening, redirecting and refocusing of foundation and nonprofit efforts to better meet the needs of the disenfranchised. This publication serves as a primer for progressive change during an era dominated by political conservatism.

Upcoming from NCRP

Substantive Philanthropic Accountability

This winter, NCRP will release a report on substantive philanthropic accountability. The foundation accountability debate has become cluttered with a surfeit of suggestions and approaches that impair substantive progress towards a stronger sector. This report reveals the pivotal issues and concrete steps foundations, nonprofits and the public should address in the accountability debate. It is an important step in encouraging both the government and foundations to demonstrate the sector's substantive accountability to and regain the trust of the American public.

NCRP Board of Directors

Marilyn Aguire-Molina	Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health
Christine Ahn	Korea Policy Institute
Andrea Alexander	Potlatch Fund
Dave Beckwith	Needmor Fund
Lana Cowell	National Alliance for Choice in Giving (NCRP Board Secretary)
Louis Delgado	
Richard Farias	Tejano Center for Community Concerns
Diane Feeney	French American Charitable Trust
Deborah Felder	Maine Initiatives
Marjorie Fine	Center for Community Change
Bookda Gheisar	Social Justice Fund Northwest
Cynthia Guyer	Portland Schools Foundation
Judy Hatcher	Environmental Support Center
David R. Jones	Community Service Society (NCRP Board Chair)
Rhoda Karpatkin	Consumers Union (NCRP Board Treasurer)
Larry Kressley	(NCRP Board Vice Chair)
Peter B. Manzo	The Advancement Project
Nadia Moritz	The Young Women's Project
Russell Roybal	National Gay and Lesbian Task Force
Gary Snyder	Nonprofit Management Group
Helen Vinton	Southern Mutual Help Association
Jodi Williams	Community Solutions Fund
Emeritus	
Paul S. Castro	Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles
John Echohawk	Native American Rights Fund
Pablo Eisenberg	Georgetown University Public Policy Institute
Terry Odendahl	Institute for Collaborative Change

visit: www.ncrp.org/publications



national committee for
responsive philanthropy

2001 S Street NW • Suite 620 • Washington, DC 20009

Address Service Requested

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Washington, DC
PERMIT NO 273