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**Introduction**

Buenos Aires, summer, 1988. Kathleen McCarthy slowly huffed her way to the top floor of a very tall building to do one last meeting. It came at the end of a remarkable trip to Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and Latin America in search of candidates for a new International Fellows Program (IFP) at what was then called the Center for the Study of Philanthropy, at The Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY). The program was created with backing from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, while the Ford Foundation had opened doors via its field offices in three continents to help identify candidates.

Over 100 NGO leaders were interviewed en route, and by the time McCarthy got to Argentina the pattern was clear. Global civil society was flourishing, with a rising tide of social activist and development NGOs, but in most parts of the world grantmaking was almost unknown, aside from the work of foreign donors. Most foundations were operating foundations, running fellowship programs, hospitals, art museums, funding favored charities, but deeply divided from community activists. Although countries like India and Egypt had far older philanthropic traditions than the United States, Kenya a pervasive history of communal mutual aid, and Malaysia, Indonesia, and Brazil and Argentina had longstanding patterns of religious giving, modern grantmaking foundations were virtually unknown. And in places like Argentina, even the word philanthropy was taboo.

It was also shortly after the end of a brutal dictatorship in Argentina, and many people were still unwilling to even answer their telephones, which made this meeting particularly special. McCarthy’s quarry that day was Andrés Thompson, a sociologist familiar with NGOs and a recently-returned refugee. His reception was cordial, but not encouraging. And after traveling one and a half times around the world seeking candidates, he was one of the most promising potential candidates. The program was launched at a time when even Americans felt that philanthropy was uniquely their own. McCarthy had been met with courtesy and polite skepticism.

There were exceptions of course, like Noshir Dadrawala, who was working with organizations related to the Tata family business empire in Mumbai, and scholar/activists McCarthy met at a Salzburg Seminar the following May, such as Richard Ebil-Ottuo from Uganda, and Quintin Oliver from Northern Ireland. But the program was clearly ahead of its time.

When what eventually became the Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society was founded in 1986, one of its three areas of activity was international giving and voluntarism. This is an important point, since the intervening decades – a relatively short time – have witnessed the globalization of modern philanthropy. And the Center’s International Fellows Program, which seemed so farfetched as McCarthy crawled her way up that last flight of stairs in Buenos Aires, has helped to nurture and staff this trend.

Moreover, both the practice and the meaning of philanthropy have changed dramatically. Three decades ago, there were few research centers or regional and global infrastructure organizations, and grantmaking foundations were mainly an American phenomenon. Now they exist on every
continent. In 1988, community foundations were distinguished primarily by their role in enabling individuals to pool their endowments for community betterment, and with the ability to invoke the doctrine of *cy pres* to change the type of recipients without altering their donors’ original intent as local needs and possible remedies changed. Today, communal philanthropy is often as important as endowment building. What seemed to be purely American practices in 1988 were global by 2017.

None of which was even remotely apparent when the Fellows Program was launched in 1989. Only seventeen candidates applied, most of whom were NGO representatives. Fortunately, Thompson was among them, as were Myrna Cacho (Executive Director of the Association of Foundations, The Philippines) and Achintya Ghosh from India (PRADAN).

In the beginning, the Program was very loosely structured, since there was no solid curricular material on philanthropy or NGOs available at that time. Although the now-defunct Program on Nonprofit Organizations at Yale had been running for several years, generating a host of important working papers on nonprofit organizations, the first wave of Center development only began in the mid-1980s, a response to Reaganomics, and some of the mythologies that were being invoked to reduce government spending on public welfare broadly defined.

Much of the nonprofit and philanthropic infrastructure that now circles the globe was in its infancy or not yet born, with the exception of organizations such as the Council on Foundations and the Foundation Center in the United States and the Hague Club, a forerunner of the European Foundation Centre in Europe. So we were all still finding our way.

Nearly thirty years later, the world of philanthropy has dramatically changed. The globe is laced with international, regional and national umbrella organizations to nurture and promote the growth of modern philanthropy. Once primarily an American institution, community foundations are now a global phenomenon, and Centers on philanthropy and nonprofits exist in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa. The Center’s International Fellows played a prominent role in many of these developments, trends illustrated by statistics and their stories.

*The Program*

Since it was launched in 1989, the International Fellows Program’s 208 alumni have helped to spearhead the globalization of philanthropy in over 65 countries and on every continent. The IFP is highly competitive, sometimes drawing as many as 600 candidates nominated by foundations, philanthropists and IF alumni from around the world. Fellows are chosen by a selection committee of leaders in the field, such as Ford’s Executive Vice President, Francis X. Sutton, and Peter Bell, the President of Care, in the program’s early years.
Rather than teaching nonprofit management, the IFP is a leadership training program. Instead of simply sharing American models, it has focused on global patterns and trends from the beginning, with an emphasis on building on indigenous traditions to create new cultures of giving.

It currently has two components: a three-month Emerging Leaders program for young scholar-practitioners that provides a broad overview of the field and replicable models, and a one-month Senior Fellows Program for decision-makers at a more advanced stage of their careers who explore best practices from around the globe.

Fellows attend a graduate-level seminar several times a week with scholars, American and international foundation leaders, and other practitioners. This allows them to read broadly in the field as well as doing research on trends or issues of interest to their organizations. They also meet with visiting alumni and other leaders, do site visits, and attend professional meetings.

Their research broadens their contacts, some of whom become lifelong mentors, and each Fellow is required to have a dissemination plan on their return to broaden the audiences for their findings. Many Fellows publish their papers in scholarly and professional journals, and many have used them as collateral for getting onto national and international conference programs. Connections maintained with their cohorts and other alumni provide ongoing peer-learning networks and professional opportunities.
Earlier Evaluations

The Center conducted aggregate alumni surveys in 2004, 2008 and 2014. Of the 82 respondents (from 191 Fellows surveyed) who responded in 2014:

- More than 70% took part in founding 98 new nonprofit and philanthropic organizations.

![Types of Organizations (98) Founded by Fellows](chart)

- 65% published on civil society topics between 2000 and 2014, producing over 200 articles and publications on the Third Sector.

- Most worked in the sector for 10 years or more; 58% were in senior managerial positions.

- 69% served as board members and volunteers in civil society organizations, including the major national, regional and international associations.

- 71% reported that the program advanced their careers by deepening their knowledge, adding prestige and confidence, widening their perspectives and providing opportunities for international networking.

![Fellows Active in Professional Networks](chart)
Their stories reveal some of the richness and variety of their contributions, collaboration and careers.

**The Milan Focus Group**

On October 12 through 15, 2016, CPCS convened four days of meetings in Milan and Como, Italy — in part with RBF funds — to examine the past, present and future of philanthropy through the eyes of its International Fellows. Thirty-five of the Center’s International Fellows alumni attended, representing 24 countries. The participants spanned four generations, from pre-boomers to millennials, who entered the field at different stages in its development, providing a wide array of perspectives. (See Attachments A and B for a list of participants and their bios.)

The first day consisted of interviews to follow up on questionnaires distributed earlier, and a focus group meeting with selected Kellogg, Ford, and Rockefeller Brothers Fund Fellows plus a few Rockefeller and Mott Fellows brought in with RBF funds, to evaluate the long term impact of the grants on their careers. (See Attachment C for a sample questionnaire.) The focus group was facilitated by Merrill Sovner, a former Program Officer at the Open Society Foundations, an evaluation professional at The Atlantic Philanthropies, and a Hearst Fellow at CPCS. (See Attachments D and E for staff bios and a list of focus group participants.)

The entire group of participants attended the meetings on October 13 and 14, to discuss the past, present and future of the program and the field, while the final day consisted of a meeting with members of the Italian nonprofit and philanthropic sector coordinated by the Cariplo Foundation and Comasca (Fondazione Provinciale della Comunità Comasca) in Como, Italy.

The pre-conference interviews and focus group were designed to illuminate not only how far the field has come, but also the Fellows’ roles in catalyzing these changes, and to begin to winnow which elements of the program helped them to become leaders in the field. The aim here was to address the larger issue of what makes a program like this tick.

The Fellows often say that the program “changed their lives,” or that it “taught them to see.” The interviews and focus group were conducted with selected Fellows on the first day of the meeting to unpack this, and identify how it shaped their subsequent careers. As the conversations progressed, we found that many of the Fellows could pinpoint a specific moment when they began to see things differently. They called this an “aha!” moment, as mentioned further below.

For example, Andrés Thompson (funded by RBF, 1989) was already familiar with nonprofits through his time as a refugee in the Netherlands after fleeing the junta in Argentina. But he was less than enthusiastic about the idea of philanthropy. When he came to the US, he began to notice that it was everywhere, right down to memorial plaques on park benches.

The program also encouraged him to see philanthropy and NGOs as part of a coherent sector. When he returned, he began to “see it everywhere,” in Argentina as well. He began to do research on Latin American philanthropy, created a periodical about the field, Tercer Sector, modeled on the Chronicle of Philanthropy, and ultimately went on to head the Kellogg’s Latin Amer-
ican philanthropy program. He also created his own continent-wide Leaders in Philanthropy program through Kellogg, and helped to launch a community philanthropy venture in Uruguay. The traveling seminars for his Fellows resulted in the creation of several new foundations, corporate and teaching programs, in what he termed “a large multiplier effect.”

**Noshir Dadrawala** (RBF, 1990) had never been outside of India before he was a Fellow. In addition to learning to use a computer and other forms of Western technology, he had an opportunity to study community foundations and to interview leaders like Lorie Slutsky of the New York Community Trust. Upon his return, he helped to found India’s first community foundation based on his learnings, The Bombay Community Public Trust. He also had an opportunity to study American nonprofit law and the IRS classification system, material that shaped his book on nonprofit law, which helped to establish him as a legal authority (he currently serves on the board of the International Center for Nonprofit Law). And his learnings about fundraising in the US resulted in another book. As he explained, he learned the importance of tax incentives and deductions during the IFP. Perhaps most tellingly, he said “saw” Mumbai’s pavement dwellers for the first time on his way home from the airport. He also studied Rusy Sumariwalla’s taxonomy of civil society, which opened his eyes to “the enormity, diversity and depth of India’s civil society sector.” Like Andrés Thompson, the program taught Noshir to view his country in a new way, a function of being overseas for an extended period of time, as well as his strategic use of the Center's contacts.

One of the themes that emerged from the interviews with the earliest participants was the way in which the Fellowship sparked their decision to embark on new careers. When **Quintin Oliver** (RBF, 1991) arrived, he was heading the Northern Ireland Council of Voluntary Associations. After four months, he realized that he “wasn’t indispensable back home,” which ultimately led him into an alternative career. He also brought home the idea of a cohesive sector, which encouraged him to create the “Yes” campaign around the Irish peace referendum, using the nonprofit community as a megaphone to translate the complex ideas of the negotiations into language that the average citizen could understand. Since then, Quintin has done conflict resolution work in 25 countries, from Cyprus to Colombia, and recently set up an operating foundation that works on reconciliation.

In the case of **Bhekinkosi Moyo** (Mott, 2003, South Africa), the “aha” moment of change came on a field trip to Michigan at the invitation of his mentor, Rob Collier. Bheki was already beginning to study philanthropy in Africa when he came into the Center’s ambit after he met McCarthy at an International Society for Third-Sector Research (ISTR) conference, who encouraged him to apply for a Fellowship. The IFP Selection Committee agreed that he was a promising candidate and awarded him a Fellowship. The Center gave him the conceptual tools to sharpen his studies, and put him into contact with leaders such as Dorothy Reynolds and Barry Gberman, relationships that he maintained. Emmett Carson was his IFP mentor, one of many “resource people who were luminaries and already heroes,” some of whom “became personal mentors for life.” When he was doing site visits to the foundations in Michigan with Rob Collier, he realized that he was destined not to become an academic, but to dedicate his life to philanthropy as a scholar-activist.
Since his return, Bheki co-authored one of the first books on philanthropy in Africa, served on the board of ISTR, and helped to establish an African Philanthropy prize and a research chair in African philanthropy at University of the Witwatersrand. He also heads the Southern African Trust. And he has supported philanthropic projects in Zimbabwe, his native country.

Amelia Fauzia (Ford, 2009) published a book from her IFP paper, and created a small community foundation at her university in Indonesia.

Helena Monteiro (Kellogg, 2006, Brazil) had had a substantial career in international development and health before she entered the field of philanthropy in 2005. The following year, she became a Senior Fellow, providing her first opportunity to study the global dimensions of the field, including community foundations. As she explained, there were a lot of debates about what these institutions were and how they operated in Brazil, and her learnings gave her an important voice in these discussions. Helena later served as the Executive Director of Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS).

Several Fellows underscored the importance of the Center’s emphasis on global comparisons as a key factor in shaping their own line of vision. As Helena noted, the program was created to be international, whereas most centers are looking at America, and encouraging people to follow US best practices. Noshir also mentioned that the program at CUNY “changed his whole perspective,” including broadening his line of vision to international issues. Even the cultural immersion at International House where the Fellows resided in New York was important.

Other Fellows mentioned the benefit of the CUNY brand and enhanced expertise. Svitlana Kuts (Rockefeller, 1997, Ukraine) had been in the sector for three years when she arrived at the Center. As she explained, she didn’t fully understand what the sector was. The program not only gave her an overview well beyond anything she could have mastered in Ukraine, but also trained her to write fluently and well about it. The time in New York enabled her to read widely, including about pre-Communist philanthropy, and to meet a variety of experts. Her paper was later published, providing a touchstone on the meaning of philanthropy during the transition years, and it is still used by libraries and as a key academic piece. She also began to write for other organizations such as Germany’s Ministry of Social Welfare and CIVICUS, becoming an international expert on post-communist philanthropy. As Bheki Moyo explained, “Participation in the IFP is enough to convince people that you are an authority.”

Like Helena Monteiro, Daniele Giudici (Mott, 2014, Italy) used his learnings to import new ideas. Two were particularly important. First, the need to inspire people and demonstrate results. To do this, he now shares a WINGS video to help people visualize philanthropy. Second, community philanthropy isn’t just about financials; it’s about engaging the community, ideas he has spread through his work with several Italian community foundations, ASSIFERO, and the Lambriana Foundation of the Diocese of Milan.

One of the most interesting generational divides was between vision and learnings. Just as Daniele brought home ideas about the need for demonstrable results and community involvement as his key learnings, Catherine Kiganjo (Ford, 2006, Kenya) confirmed the importance of what she was already working on in Kenya: the need for co-ownership of the development process. “No
ownership, no program.” So now they’re focusing at Kenya Community Development Foundation on matching grants, to ensure that philanthropy comes from the community level.

For Anderson Giovani da Silva (Kellogg, 2009, Brazil), the key takeaway was the importance of transparency and innovation for community foundations. “If you have to stay for 150 years, you have to keep up with the zeitgeist.”

Andrés’s key learning was a more theoretical understanding of the sector. He had been doing research on NGOs, “but had no idea that there were theories about it.” The program helped to shape a comprehensive vision, and when he went back to Argentina he wrote a book outlining the connections that helped to put the nonprofit sector on the map, along with the idea that you have to take the nonprofit sector into account when making social policy.

For Amelia, her “aha” moment was when she realized that philanthropy was embedded in a range of religious traditions. As she explained, she “suddenly understood what philanthropy was when Dorothy Reynolds was talking about John D. Rockefeller’s commitment to tithing,” which enabled her to see philanthropy in a new way. Daniele had a similar “aha” moment, since he, too, works in religious philanthropy.

Andrés suggested that the Center moves people from academia to practice, an idea that was supported by Amelia, Quintin and Bheki as well. Like Quintin, Andrés now regards himself as a philanthropist who donates money, skills and time, as does Anderson.

From vision to learnings; from local to global, from scholarship to action to personal philanthropy: these are the trajectories the Fellows described in the IFP's development over the past three decades.

**Oral Histories**

In addition to aggregate evaluations mentioned above and described more fully in Appendix 1, the Center conducted in-depth interviews over the course of 6-10 hours each with Andrés Thompson (RBF, 1989; Kellogg, 2005), Bhekinkosi Moyo (Mott, 2003), and Marwa El-Daly (Rockefeller, 2001) in 2006-8. The oral histories provide highly detailed narratives of their professional development and contributions to the field before, during and after their fellowships. Some of this material is included here to illuminate the complex universe of factors that can shape a career, and where the fellowship fit within that matrix of influences for these particular individuals. It also allows them to share their stories more fully in their own words.

_Both Marwa El-Daly and Bheki Moyo participated in the Milan focus group with funding from RBF; Andrés was in the first cohort of RBF Fellows in 1989._
Marwa El-Daly, Rockefeller, 2001, Egypt

Prior to coming to the Center at the age of 27, Marwa was working as a Program Coordinator at the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA), developing programs and writing reports for partner agencies. She was also finishing an M.A. in Professional Development at American University in Cairo, and had been volunteering in youth programs for 10 years.

Her IF paper on “Islamic Philanthropy: Institutionalized Giving in the Muslim Perspective,” looked at the history of Muslim giving; Islamic foundations in the United States and Pakistan; the potential for replication in Egypt; diaspora philanthropy; and community foundations. Her recommendations included the need to revive and modernize different forms of Muslim and Coptic waqfs, with an emphasis on transparency, trust, and partnerships with civil society organizations and government; the need for greater access to information on philanthropy; and the need to promote diaspora giving and philanthropic activity by people of all ages, including using the internet to build networks.

She quit her job with ICA before she arrived because they wouldn’t give her three months to attend the program. After she returned, they offered to take her back, but she moved on to the Near East Foundation. She also met John Gerhart at the Ford Foundation in New York, and worked with him on an idea for creating a center like CPCS at the American University in Cairo.

Since then, she headed the Egyptian team in Ford’s multi-country study of Islamic philanthropy, completed a Ph.D. at Humboldt University in Germany; founded one of the first community foundations in Egypt; worked with the Ministry of Social Affairs to liberalize the laws governing waqfs, which had been nationalized under Nasser; became an Ashoka Fellow; and won the inaugural African Philanthropy Award of the African Grantmakers Network in 2012.

In her oral history, Marwa drew many connections between her time at the Center and her subsequent activities. She said that when she heard about the program it was a “great relief,” because few people in Egypt treated philanthropy as important and she felt extremely isolated.

Having a chance to study giving in a more open society was “a lifetime opportunity.” “The program was one of the major things that made a big shift in my life,” because it made “you see things and invest[ed] in you.” It also inspired her to believe she could be a change agent and “open[ed] the world for you to see, and it’s up to you what you do with it,” which she contends “constituted a turning point” in her life.

One of the surprises and a key learning was the way in which the Muslim community was reinventing traditional giving, including online fundraising. Marwa interviewed the leaders of many of these organizations while she was here, shortly before 9/11. Afterwards, some of them were shut down under the Patriot Act.

As she explains, “I came back from New York and decided that I wanted to create a center for philanthropy, to study philanthropy, to invest in philanthropy training, CSR, and how to be a philanthropist, to create a center like yours to do peer exchanges. I was full of ideas...”

She identified the program’s greatest strength as “the exposure, just in looking at New York and the community foundation model, exposure to big foundations like Ford and Rockefeller, and having them present in our class...you brought people like Barry Gaberman from Ford, a major foundation leader, into a very friendly environment [to] talk about development like peers. I was
coming from a background...where people were hierarchical.” It allowed you to “capture their interest and they believe in what you’re doing, that was one of the great advantages of the program.”

Based on her IF research – as well as insights from her master’s and doctoral dissertations and her work on the Ford project on Islamic philanthropy – she subsequently created the Maadi Community Foundation in Cairo, blending indigenous traditions of philanthropy with the community foundation model. She also found ingenious ways of raising funds and building community, such as bringing rich and poor children together in an art school project, and then selling their works at a community sale to raise funds for the foundation.

Although she had already done some research on Islamic philanthropy for her master’s degree, she had not yet encountered the International Society for Third Sector Research, which the Center introduced her to on a trip to Washington, DC. She subsequently became very involved, which also brought her into contact with Rupert graf Strachwitz, who introduced her to her future advisor at Humboldt University, and who encouraged her to pursue her Ph.D. there. ISTR “consolidated the scholarly passion” in her, and provided an outlet for her to continue to link research and practice. As she explained, “Just by introducing people, you can influence a sequence of incidents that can change people’s lives.”

Clearly Marwa had a variety of influences that shaped her career, from her graduate study at AUC and Humboldt to her involvement with ISTR, her work with the Ford project, and mentors like John Gerhardt and Count Strachwitz.

But some things can be attributed directly to the fellowship:

1) Immersion in a different culture, and access to different philanthropic models, from community foundations to Islamic nonprofits and online fundraising;

2) Networking opportunities that introduced her to key figures in big foundations such as Rockefeller and Ford, and organizations like ISTR;

3) A sense of community for a previously isolated philanthropic entrepreneur in the making; and

4) A deepened sense of confidence in her own ability to effect change.

It also directly affected her willingness to change jobs, moving from an International NGO to a foundation, and strengthened her credentials for dealing with the Egyptian government in liberalizing the country’s legal framework for waqfs.

It augmented her portfolio of contacts and models by helping to globalize her perspective, which was bolstered not only by the geographical diversity of the nine other Fellows in her cohort (which included Fellows from Russia, Kenya, South Africa, Latvia, and Australia, among others), but also their research.

Finally, it provided an opportunity to develop an in-depth knowledge of another culture as a window onto deepening her understanding of her own; and a more global perspective that may have strengthened her role in subsequent regional and international projects.

So, arguably, the impact on Marwa’s career was fairly clear cut, despite the array of other opportunities and influences that left a discernable imprint.
**Bhekinkosi Moyo, Mott, 2003, South Africa**

The RBF grant also enabled us to include Dr. Bhekinkosi Moyo in the pre-conference focus group in Milan.

Bheki was a 28-year-old graduate student in his second year in the Political Studies department at Witwatersrand University in Johannesburg working on a dissertation on philanthropy and the third sector in South Africa when he met Dr. McCarthy at an ISTR conference in Cape Town and she invited him to apply. At that point in his career, he had interviewed nonprofit leaders and representatives of a number of US foundations based in South Africa for his dissertation, and had attended two conferences outside southern Africa, in Poland in Uganda. He also served as a Research Manager with the Tshwaranang Legal Advocacy Center in Johannesburg, working on gender issues. Prior to that, he had been a high school teacher in Zimbabwe.

According to Bheki, the ISTR “encounter was to define my journey today.” At that point in his career, he wanted to “dedicate my research skills and time to studying the sector,” and hoped that the program would give him “a broader understanding of philanthropy.”

His IFP paper on “Community Foundations, Social Capital and Development in South Africa” addressed one of the program’s enduring questions: what creates a culture of philanthropy in different national settings? To answer that, he looked at indigenous practices such as *Ubuntu* and *stokvels*, as well as the Ford, Mott and Kellogg initiatives in launching the Uthungulu and Stutterheim Community Foundations. His conclusions argued for the need to graft community foundations to indigenous practices to reconceive the concept of CFs within a South African context, building them not only on large donations but also communal mutual aid — ideas that anticipated many of the newer models of community philanthropy today.

On his return, he presented papers based, in part, on his findings at conferences across Africa, including a Ford Foundation retreat in South Africa. By 2005, he was presenting at UN meetings. He also published a report for Ford’s South Africa office on “Philanthropy in the 21st Century…A Study of Southern Africa” in 2004.

Two years later, he became a Research Fellow at TrustAfrica, where he coordinated the first pan-African scholarly research network on African philanthropy, later serving as the organization’s Acting Director before moving on to head the Southern African Trust. More recently, he helped to launch the South African Grantmakers Association’s African Philanthropy Award, and the first university chair on African Philanthropy at Witwatersrand.

In 2015, he “addressed the UN General Assembly on the role of philanthropy in the implementation of sustainable development goals.” He also helped to create the Africa Philanthropy Network in 2009.

Bheki Moyo received the Global Fund for Community Foundations Alekseeva Award for outstanding contributions to the field in 2017.

According to Bheki, the program convinced him that he could be more of an activist without surrendering his academic inclinations. Beginning with his work at TrustAfrica, he focused on “developing a new narrative on the study of philanthropy in the continent,” to illuminate “African forms of philanthropy…philanthropy in Africa…[and] philanthropy that might have African characteristics.”
As he explained in his proposal for the IFP conference in Milan, “my encounter with [the Center] was the beginning of the journey that has seen me research, publish, serve on boards of philanthropies, support work on philanthropy as well as help strategize on how to engage with philanthropy.” “It was at the Centre…that I fully grasped what was ahead of me.”

Looking at the record more dispassionately, four things do seem to have helped to shape his career early on. First, the CPCS fellowship took him out of Africa for the second time, allowing him to network with a wide array of scholars, institutions and foundation practitioners, including Rob Collier, one of the program’s IF mentors, Emmett Carson, another mentor, and Barry Gaberman, among many others.

Second, he had access to a far broader array of scholarly and foundation literature in the US than he had been able to access in South Africa.

Third, the program gave him a global network of peers from Italy, Sri Lanka, Canada, Taiwan, Jamaica, China, Mexico, India, and Bosnia and Herzegovina in his cohort. As he noted, “it was very useful for me. It really opened your eyes.”

Finally, the time in the United States may have also sharpened his understanding of what was genuinely African and how that contrasted with western practices.

In addition to producing cosmopolites, one of the program’s goals is to nurture scholar/practitioners who have the ability to discuss the sector with a variety of audiences, from scholars to policymakers. Bheki Moyo’s career exemplifies that ideal.

The RBF Fellows

RBF initiated the IF program in 1988 with a threefold goal: 1) to broaden American awareness of the practice of giving and voluntarism in other countries; 2) to bring a limited number of young visiting scholars to New York for one semester to work on research projects with local nonprofits; and 3) to build an international network of scholars and practitioners in the nonprofit arena. The ideal candidate was initially envisioned as having some research experience, active ties to community-based NGOs in developing nations, and an ability to wed research to development work.

It also gave preference to candidates without extensive international experience, especially those working with women’s groups, and on urban poverty, health and conservation. Although this didn’t work out exactly as planned, the geographical range represented by the first cohorts of Fellows was quite broad, including India, the Philippines, Argentina, Northern Ireland, Brazil, Sudan, Peru and Uganda.

During its first three years, the IFP was broadly cast. Fellows attended John Palmer Smith’s classes on nonprofit organizations at the New School and a weekly seminar on philanthropy at The Graduate Center, did internships with national and international organizations, met with foundation and nonprofit leaders, attended conferences, and worked on research papers.
1989 Cohort: Andrés Thompson, Argentina (drawn from his oral history)

Andrés was a recently returned political exile when Professor McCarthy met him in 1988. A leftist student activist, he was kidnapped and “disappeared” for 15 days shortly after Argentina’s military coup in 1977. Upon his release, he was told he had 48 hours to leave the country under pain of death, fleeing with his pregnant wife to São Paulo. Later, they were relocated to the Netherlands by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, escaping the Brazilian dictatorship as well.

His first book, on unions and military regimes in Chile and Argentina, was published there in 1981. He also completed an M.A. in Development Studies at the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague, and co-founded the Argentine Committee for Human Rights, his first venture into the nonprofit arena.

After returning to the Southern Cone in the early 1980s he worked at CEDES and GADIS, think tanks that attracted former refugees, and became Associate Professor of History at the University of Buenos Aires. Most of his publications at that point were on unions and politics; his first articles on NGOs appeared in 1988.

In effect, when he and McCarthy met, he was newly “interested in nonprofits, [but] not philanthropy.” “The first time I heard the word philanthropy was when [she] came into my office in 1988,” he noted. When he looked it up in the dictionary, he decided that it was irrelevant for Argentina. For him, the NGO sector was political. “It had nothing to do with philanthropy.”

Even the nonprofit sector was “hidden, traditional [and] small” at that time. “Undiscovered. Nobody knew about [Argentina’s] non-profit sector. There was no knowledge about it.” The only groups that surfaced in the public’s imagination during the military regime were Las Madres and Las Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo. Thompson was one of the first to map Argentina’s nonprofit sector, which is why McCarthy made the pilgrimage to his office.

He ultimately applied to the IF program because “the legacy of the repressive culture was still very strong” and he was having trouble readapting. “And I was still very young, so I didn’t have many credentials to help establish my place there.”

His IF proposal focused on the role of NGOs, cooperatives and foreign donors in dealing with neoliberal agendas in Argentina, but his paper — which was subsequently published as a CPCS working paper — also included one of the first overviews of Argentine foundations.

Andrés later cast his fellowship as a major turning point in his career: the IF program “opened[ed] my mind to a different culture, to a different view of philanthropy, NGOs, the non-profit sector….I’d never paid attention to the whole issue of volunteers, or volunteering as a form of civic engagement in public affairs. The important thing for me was militancy, not volunteering…..It was amazing, discovering this side of things.”

On his return, he encountered “the same kind of things [in Argentina]. I started looking with different eyes….things that had been totally invisible to me about volunteering, about giving…things that worked in ways that were totally foreign to me before.”

In effect, it enabled him see his “own culture differently.”
Andrés also embarked on a number of new ventures in the first two to three years after he returned. First, he did a Kellogg-funded research project for the Center in 1991 on “Philanthropy and Ecology in South America,” looking at NGOs in Buenos Aires, Santiago and Sao Paulo, which was published as another CPCS working paper, and may have helped to bring him into the Kellogg ambit.

Second, he launched Tercer Sector, which also caught Kellogg’s attention. As he explained, the notion of philanthropy “was very underdeveloped in Latin America at that time.” The concept of a cohesive nonprofit sector broad enough to include traditional charities like the Socieded de Beneficiencia with Amnesty International and Greenpeace was another “big discovery in New York,” one that he shared with Argentinian journalists through Tercer Sector, which was modeled on The Chronicle of Philanthropy.

As he later recalled, “I wrote something about philanthropy and giving in that first number….the magazine is still alive. It’s self-funded [and]….It has had a lot of influence in the media.” The magazine played “a very important role in raising public awareness about the non-profit sector. It was starting to become a field….”

Third, he introduced the first coursework on the nonprofit sector at the National University of Buenos Aires in 1991.

From 1994 to 2010, Andrés was the Kellogg Foundation’s Program Director for Latin America, where he spun off more university-based programs, initiatives to seed new philanthropic ventures throughout Latin America, and even his own regional Leaders in Philanthropy fellowship program and traveling seminars, which resulted in several new foundations.

He also helped to broker additional funds for several cohorts of Latin American CPCS Fellows through the Kellogg Foundation.

In 2005, he returned to CPCS as a Senior Fellow himself to study whether community foundations were a viable option for Latin American and the Caribbean. He also considered legal and tax incentives, wealth and resource mobilization, and the community foundation model as an exit strategy for external donors via resource mobilization in local communities.

Afterwards, he helped to create the first CF in Uruguay and published his learnings in “Community Foundations in Latin America, Can the Concept be Adapted?” (Alliance, March 2006 11:1). More recently, Andrés and another Fellow, Florencia Roitstein (Mott, 2015, Argentina), spearheaded the ELLAS program to promote women’s giving circles in Argentina, and Andrés also currently serves as the Executive Coordinator of the Philanthropy Network for Social Justice in Brazil. This network attracted other Brazilian IFs as well, including Graciela Hopstein (Mott, 2014), Henrique Conca Bussacos (Mott, 2012), Anderson Giovani Da Silva (Kellogg, 2010) and Mariane Maier Nunes (Mott, 2017).

Like Bheki Moyo, Thompson managed to straddle the scholar/practitioner divide throughout his career. His current CV lists 20 books, articles, and edited volumes on the field, as well as “more than 100 articles” in newspapers, journals, blogs and magazines on labor and third sector issues. He also served on the board of the International Society for Third Sector Research, on the faculties of several Salzburg Seminars on philanthropy and nonprofits, and was a Senior Fellow at the Synergos Institute.
To a far greater degree than any of the other RBF Fellows, the IF program left an unmistakable imprint on Andrés Thompson’s career and his subsequent contributions to the field.

While he might have pursued a career in nonprofits had he not been an IF, it is far less likely that he would have gone into philanthropy or become a program officer for one of the major American foundations. As he explained, “Although I was involved with non-profits previously, I hadn’t had the capacity to see them from a broader perspective….my participation in the International Fellows Program…was crucial.”

1989 Cohort: Myrna Gimena Cacho, The Philippines

The Philippines had a strong and growing culture of secular philanthropy in the 1980s, as well as one of the region’s most vibrant collection of NGOs. For example, Philippine Business for Social Development (PBSP) was a coalition of Philippine corporate donors. Based on Venezuela’s Dividendo Volontario, its members divided 1% of their pretax net incomes between their own corporate social responsibility programs and PBSP’s regranting projects with NGOs. Another key organization was the Association of Foundations.

Myrna Cacho was the Association’s Executive Director when she joined the first cohort. Drawing on her background in agricultural and community development, her application focused on the role of NGOs in breaking the poverty cycle, and the need for both local and foreign training in order to maximize human resources within her country. As she explained in her proposal, her background blended “both research and training from the grassroots level and on towards the policymaking sectors.” She also had “not been exposed [to] any overseas experience,” one of the program’s early criteria, and felt that “the time has come…to look at the Philippines from another angle.”

Her IF paper examined American support for Philippine NGOs under the Marcos and Aquino regimes, and she did a separate study of American foundation grants to the Philippines during the Marcos regime and the transition to democracy.

Myrna also used her time in New York to spin off a variety of new initiatives. For example, she helped to launch the Philippine Development Fund with backing from the Association of Foundations and the Agape Fund, to encourage Filipino-Americans to support NGOs, educate potential donors on development in the Philippines, and establish a common fund for small NGOs.

She attended an Interaction conference on “Strategic Issues for the 1990s: Challenges to PVOs in an Interdependent World” alongside Philippine delegates from the political right, which enabled her to:

“act as a bridge between my sector and other networks… The executive directors before me had been part of the support class and never intermingled with the other networks. That was the start of collaboration between us. We all worked together as the Philippine Human Resource for Community Development – an alliance over all agencies, a project of Canadian CIDA. We set up the Philippine Development Assistance Association. I set them up….We were enthusiastic to bridge and reform.”

In a report penned at the end of her fellowship, Myrna concluded that “The biggest benefit derived from the fellowship has been the opportunity to liaise with various heads of organizations”
including “55 key officers from 34 organizations in the United States,” which widened the Association’s working relationships as well as her own.

She was particularly struck by her time at the Foundation Center (FC), where she researched their international holdings and discovered books on foundations in the US and Europe that revealed the size and scope of the field. The FC gave her books to take back to the Philippines that illustrated “how big the sector was here and helped me to echo what I was able to see here. Philanthropy [in the Philippines] was a concept only for the rich at that time.”

Another byproduct of her Foundation Center internship was the first Directory of Philippine Foundations, which was modeled in part on FC publications. After Myrna’s return, the Association of Foundations initiated an information sharing and exchange program with the Foundation Center, further strengthening the ties between the two institutions.

The following year, she became the president of the Research and Development Foundation of the Management Association, which handled the corporate social responsibility programs for the country’s largest and most conservative association of CEOs and business owners. “They viewed me skeptically – that was another challenge. The fact that I didn’t apply but was invited to join was a change for them, [as was] to hire from the third sector and outside of the business sector.”

From 1990-95, Myrna used this position to build partnerships with government, particularly with the Secretary of Agriculture (Ernesto Garlao, the former head of PBSP) and the President of the Land Bank of Philippines. The result was the Livelihood Enhancement for Agricultural Development (LEAD) program, which raised incomes for rural farmers and households by connecting them to market and supply chains, an objective shared by PBSP. Backed by the banks and the business sector, it was implemented through the Department of Agriculture.

“This was the most difficult thing that I did – to be in corporate life with a development mindset,” she later recalled. “I was disillusioned and I felt I wasn’t making a difference anymore.” So she went back to school, earning a Ph.D. in Human Ecology that drew on her corporate and development experiences.

Myrna subsequently returned to New York and participated in the 2017 International Fellows Program. “This fellowship gets into you,” she explained, “it’s still the same passion to work for people-oriented projects.”

She and her husband had recently moved to the US, where she had been trying to mobilize the Filipino community. Center staff encouraged her to test a variety of models to get the community more involved, including elderbanks, a model pioneered by the Community Development Foundation of the Western Cape (South Africa) to engage isolated older residents by encouraging them to study and fund local NGOs.

She also studied youthbanks, which were the prototype for the Cape Town elderbank, and women’s giving circles, which put her back in touch with Andrés Thompson, and other Fellows such as Florencia Roitstein, and Shaun Samuels (Mott, 2013, South Africa).

Her IF project consisted of helping elderly Filipinas to create giving circles in the tri-state region, a hybrid initiative that incorporated all three models. If they can pool enough money of their
own, Myrna will seek matching funds from wealthy Filipino donors for them to distribute to nonprofits in their communities. If so, these may be the first elderbanks to be tested in the United States.

Myrna credited her initial fellowship with changing her perspective and instilling values that shaped her subsequent career. It gave her a chance to reflect on “what I can do in the Philippines.” As she explained, “Your eyes become open to see what still can be done. The most difficult part is adaptation, and you need to learn the ethnic and cultural nuances. I faced these in my fellowship in talking to Andrés and Achintya. I got to know a lot of foundations and when we went to DC to visit the United Way and the Council on Foundations….It widened my context.” Finally, it “provided a global dimension to my understanding of development…particularly the interdependence of Northern PVOs and Southern NGOs.”

As with most of the Fellows who came from a development background, Dr. Cacho was influenced most strongly by the contacts she made, including the hands-on experience at the Foundation Center and her conversations with the other Fellows. Although the IFs often come to New York with the intention of simply studying American patterns, their interactions with the other Fellows inevitably provide important models, cross-cultural learnings, and a more global perspective, as they did for Myrna. This ultimately became one of the program’s most important dimensions, one that we were able to expand across cohorts and generations at the Milan meetings.

1989 Cohort: Achintya Kumar Ghosh, India

India also had one of Asia’s liveliest and most influential NGO sectors in the late 1980s, as well as a long and venerable history of philanthropy. When the IF program began, the country’s NGO sector was under fire from the government, which was attempting to reign in foreign donations and impose a compulsory code of conduct — including salary caps — for NGO leaders.

Achintya (Achin) Ghosh came from one of those NGOs, PRADAN (Professional Assistance for Development Action), which drew young professionals into rural development work. PRADAN’s Executive Director, Deep Joshi, a former Program Officer with the Ford Foundation’s India office, noted in his recommendation letter that Achin was “action oriented and also most at home in a rural setting. He will most certainly set up an independent NGO, sooner or later”, a prediction that was ultimately fulfilled.

Surprisingly, Achin’s proposal reflected little of the political turmoil that was roiling India’s NGO sector at the time. He had been working for 8 years with grassroots rural development NGOs, and wanted to learn about U.S. models of fundraising, voluntarism, and professional nonprofit management. Toward that end, he did his IF paper on “Trends in American Foreign Assistance,” and developed reciprocal information-sharing arrangements between PRADAN and several American-based rural development agencies.

After he returned to India, he continued his work at PRADAN until 2012, serving as its Executive Director from 1997-2002. During this period, the organization scaled up its programs, and Achin oversaw its expansion to the Indian states of Bihar, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Orissa, Bihar Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh and Assam. Developing leaders and professionals was
one of his priorities, including guiding, coaching and mentoring junior professionals through the Prime Minister’s Rural Development Fellows.

He also negotiated partnerships with government and business sector, a model he saw when he visited NGOs in the US Midwest during his fellowship. “It was very inspiring. I started to think of big intervention[s].”

In 2012, Achin founded Kabil, a support organization that provides in-situ knowledge to promote rural economic development to government agencies, corporate entities, NGOs, and community based organizations. Kabil is grounded in the belief that increasing livelihoods of the rural poor requires more intensive and multidimensional engagement than previously understood, and that long term, intensive hands-on engagement is required to produce benefits. It also launches pilot projects to create prototypes appropriate to new geographies and serves as a proving ground for learning, initiatives recently expanded to Ethiopia, as well as India.

PRADAN was one of the more important organizations in India at the time. Achin was also a graduate of the Indian Institute of Management, one of the country’s premier educational institutions. But, as Joshi’s comment suggested, he was somewhat less suited for a New York-based fellowship, since his primary interest was in rural development work.

As a result, his most significant learnings occurred when he took to the road, meeting rural activists and forging a new portfolio of alliances for PRADAN, much as Myrna Cacho parlayed her fellowship into an expanded portfolio of contacts for the Association of Foundations.

He was also very interested in improving management practices, which was not part of the program, aside from the New School coursework. As the program evolved, it increasingly gravitated toward training civil society leaders rather than managers, particularly since the US had a burgeoning crop of nonprofit management courses and schools. But there was almost nothing for training civil society leaders with a global vision, aside from the IFP and the Fellows Program at Johns Hopkins. In the ensuing years, the selection committee (Frank Sutton, Senior Vice President for International Programs at Ford; Peter Bell, a former Ford Program officer who was then the President of the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation and soon to be President of Care; and Geoff Marshall, the Provost of The Graduate Center) would place a lower priority on managers who were directly engaged in rural development work.

**1990 Cohort: Noshir Dadrawala, India**

One of the liveliest centers of Indian philanthropy in the late 1980s was Mumbai, home to India’s Parsi community and the Tata philanthropies, ranging from foundations to institutions as diverse as the Tata Institute of Society Sciences and the National Centre for the Performing Arts. One of the organizations that emerged in the Tata ambit was the Center on Philanthropy, headed by Noshir Dadrawala.

Like Myrna Cacho, Noshir had never been outside of India before his Fellowship at CUNY. Trained in law, he was the Executive Secretary of the Centre for the Advancement of Philanthropy. When he applied, he had already written a handbook on the rules and regulations governing trusts in India. His application highlighted five different areas that he hoped to study: com-
munity foundations, United Ways, corporate philanthropy, and the professionalization and coordi-
nation of US charities. “There is so much we can share of American Philanthropy and adopt if
necessary to Indian conditions,” he wrote. “Sadly there is not a single institute of social science
in India to provide this exposure.”

Given his lack of international exposure, the fellowship provided a wealth of new experiences,
from studying community foundations to interviewing American leaders in philanthropy. As he
noted in the Milan focus group, “There is a lot I do in my life, in my career that I do relate to my
experience in the US. It may not be a tangible impact, but an intangible one is there… It changed
me and changed my entire perspective.”

During his Fellowship, Noshir examined American nonprofit law and the IRS classification sys-
tem, information he incorporated into a book he later wrote on nonprofit law, which bolstered his
reputation as an authority on the subject. He also met people through the Center like Russy Su-
mariwalla, the author of a taxonomy of nonprofits he developed for the United Way of America,
which was changing the way Americans understood the sector. As Noshir explained, “in those
early days, I thought about the enormity, depth and personality of the sector…. I brought home
[a taxonomy of nonprofits] and realized certain organizations actually fit into the taxonomy.
That was my “aha” moment - I [also] learned the importance of tax incentives and deductions
during the IFP.”

His learnings about fundraising in the US resulted in another book. “One of the things I was spe-
cifically asked when I left India was to go and look at fundraising trends and how funds are
raised over there…I learned about some very innovative methods of fundraising and techniques,
and I ended up a couple of years later writing a book on the art of fundraising which went into
two editions and it was pretty popular at its time.”

His visits to the New York Community Trust and other community foundations resulted in the
creation of the Bombay Community Public Trust when he returned.

Noshir became a widely respected authority on the philanthropic sector in India. He still directs
the Centre for Advancement of Philanthropy in Mumbai, providing guidance on legal, fiscal,
governance and related issues pertaining to India’s non-profit sector, including compliance issues
surrounding India’s Foreign Contributions Regulatory Act and recent corporate social respon-
sibility legislation. He also serves as a trustee of several foundations. He has continued to publish
as well, authoring several resource books. And he teaches seminars and workshops across India
on legal compliance, governance and CSR, and held visiting faculty appointments at leading In-
dian business schools.

Beyond India, he has served on several regional and global nonprofit boards, including the Inter-
national Center for Non-profit Law, the Asia Pacific Philanthropy Consortium, and the World-
wide Initiatives and Network of Grantmakers under the direction of another IFP alum, Helena
Monteiro.

During the interview in Milan, he noted that he might “not have stayed in the philanthropic sec-
tor” if he hadn’t had the fellowship. “I think the new learning that I had and the scope interna-
tionally…This fellowship made me a happier person to be in the space that I was.”

Like Andrés Thompson, Noshir is a scholar/practitioner who was strongly influenced by the con-
cepts, models and ideas he encountered in the US, adapting them to spin off a small universe of
books, institutions, courses, and other initiatives on his return, many of which can be traced directly to his time at the Center. And, like many of the Fellows, he went from heading a local institution when he arrived to becoming an international authority, board member, and leader over the course of his career.

1990 Cohort: Regina Domingues da Silva, Brazil

In 1990, Regina Domingues da Silva was a researcher who helped to set up the Ashoka office in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Her application outlined how her experiences as an Afro-Brazilian woman had shaped her drive to create a more egalitarian society. “I quickly realized that only dignity and citizenship could promote real social change,” she wrote. During her fellowship, she studied differences between Afro-American and Afro-Brazilian cultural and political movements.

Afterwards, she directed a research project on Brazilian race relations and Afro-Brazilian organizations at Instituto Brasileiro de Análises Sociais e Econômicas (IBASE), a non-profit organization for active citizens.

Regina could not be reached for the impact study, but the other Fellows in her cohort confirmed that she continued to work in the sector in Brazil. An internet search revealed that she is still listed as an associate of IBASE, having directed their program in Timor-Leste. IBASE was the sole Brazilian NGO in East Timor in 2001, and Regina coordinated a project on Sharing Experiences on Community Empowerment and Policy Development in partnership with Oxfam Australia, which led to 10 Timorese NGOs presenting a seminar at the Word Social Forum in 2002. In 2010, Regina Domingues was referenced as working for the civil society platform of the International Food Security Network of Lusophone countries (REDSAN-PALP), including Brazil and Timor-Leste.

While we can’t confirm this with Regina, it would seem that her career eventually took on a more global perspective by networking NGOs among Lusophone countries. This trajectory is consistent with other former Fellows who have confirmed that their perspectives became widened as a result of the fellowship.

As in the case of Achintya Ghosh, the Fellows who gravitated most fully toward NGOs and development tended to be those with whom we had the least contact after they left. The early years were a time of trial and error, and the emphasis on NGOs and development became more muted as the program evolved, while the emphasis on identifying candidates who had not previously traveled outside their countries was dropped.

It became increasingly clear that it had the most to offer to scholar/practitioners, and those who were tied in some way to the world of philanthropy.

1990 Cohort: Richard Ebil-Ottoo, Uganda

Prior to his fellowship, Richard Ebil-Ottoo worked with Action Contre la Faim and served as a special assistant to the Minister of Health of the Ugandan government, where he was responsible for coordinating the programs of local and international NGOs involved in health activities.
CPCS’ Director first met him when he was a Fellow and she was on the faculty of a 1989 Salzburg Seminar on philanthropy and the nonprofit sector, where she encouraged him to apply.

He deepened his familiarity with international NGOs through an internship at InterAction during his fellowship, studying policymaking and evaluation techniques. Like many of the other Fellows, he also forged a wide range of contacts through the Center. Afterwards, worked for the Volunteer Consulting Group after coming into their ambit through the fellowship.

He also went on to complete a Ph.D. in finance at Baruch College, receiving the NASDAQ Stock Market Award for the best Ph.D. Dissertation in Finance in 1997, and later secured a faculty position at Pace University, where he taught until 2015.

In addition to teaching, he engaged in a variety of nonprofit work in the United States and Uganda. He was invited to join the board of Global Educational Associates, and helped raise money in the US to finance rural projects in developing countries, especially a women’s group in Kisumu in Western Kenya. He also started a microfinance program modeled on the Grameen Bank. Richard says that his nonprofit work inspired him to undertake the financial work as a tool “to bring about peaceful coexistence, change, improved environment, bringing communities out of poverty.”

This led him into development assistance and humanitarian relief for his home region of northern Uganda, which was ravaged by civil war. He felt he was in a position to be a leader in bringing together these communities: his previous work in the first Museveni government gave him access to current government officials, while his international contacts from the IFP and the nonprofit management experience from the IFs’ New School course bolstered his expertise in project development and budgeting.

As he noted, “I am an activist, really. Because of these NGOs, [we] helped to end the war. We put pressure on both sides.” “My skills were very helpful because I could help develop proposals on how to develop cash flow and sustainability.” He then pressured the central government to donate to these local NGOs.

In 2005-2006, he took a leave of absence from his academic job to run for President of Uganda as one of six candidates. His platform focused on creating sustainable growth and livelihoods, and his campaign was advised by another International Fellow, Quintin Oliver (RBF, 1991).

When asked how he was able to avoid later persecution as an opponent of Museveni, Richard said it was “because my manifesto was only to bring great ideas, and it was fine with me if the current government took on my ideas…The local embassy is more friendly to me now. I am asked to go back now. We think of politics as part of development, and I will continue to give my views.”

Richard credits the Center’s International Fellows Program with instilling the values, the drive and the connections he needed for his contributions to Uganda. When asked how his life would be different without the fellowship, he said: “Well, number one, maybe I would not have earned my Ph.D., because it propelled me to do more. At that time, I thought that there are so many problems that need investigation and I hoped the Ph.D. would allow me to do that and understand the deeper causes.”
The fellowship was also a springboard to other fellowships, like the one from the late John Whitehead, “who I met at the International House because he was a strong proponent of nonprofits. The contacts I continued to make from that time were very helpful in the academic and business world. It also shifted my view. My connection to my country continued.”

One of the lessons learned over the course of the program’s history is the importance of unintended consequences. To our knowledge, Richard is one of only four Fellows who subsequently pursued a graduate degree and careers in the United States. He then coupled his academic position with some of the contacts and learnings from his fellowship to amplify his impact working with Uganda’s NGOs.

Perhaps the clearest links between Richard’s fellowship and his later career were his stint with the Volunteer Consulting group, his amplified understanding of international PVOs via the InterAction internship and his research, and the ancillary contacts he encountered, such as John Whitehead. But in this instance it’s harder to clearly delineate the program’s impact.

1991 Cohort: Quintin Oliver, Northern Ireland

The Center’s Director also met Quintin Oliver at the Salzburg Seminar. In 1989 he was heading the Northern Ireland Council of Voluntary Associations (NICVA), an umbrella organization representing the voluntary sector and smaller community groups in Northern Ireland.

When he came to New York for the fellowship, he was 35 and had already spent 10 years in the public sector and five in the nonprofit sector. At that point, he was just beginning to understand the relationships between the sectors, so "the timing was perfect." His application highlighted his desire for more international exposure beyond one-off conferences and visits, and the opportunity for research and study “in order to strengthen the conceptual framework in which I operate, to learn new skills and ideas and to revivify my approach to and energies for the challenges of the ‘nineties in the new Europe.”

As part of his fellowship, Quintin did an internship with the New York AIDS Coalition, and focused his research on the impact of grassroots organizations on policy development. Quintin “used the credibility of being at CUNY” to make essential contacts and enhance his status and credibility in Northern Ireland. Finally, after being away for four months, he realized that he “wasn’t indispensable back home” in his words, and that he could make other career choices. Like Andrés Thompson and Noshir Dadrawala, he took away the idea of a cohesive nonprofit sector, but applied that knowledge to different ends. He also wrote articles and appeared on local radio stations as a commentator on the Irish in America.

Five years after his fellowship, Northern Ireland’s "peace process was sharpening," and the contacts he made in New York were part of an increasingly sophisticated Irish-American lobby. He felt comfortable with the American context (he hadn’t been sympathetic when he first arrived), and the Clinton presidency was very helpful to Northern Ireland. He met several Irish players in New York, including Niall O’Dowd of the Irish Echo, and Harvey Dale through the Center’s contacts, who, in turn, introduced him to Irish-American philanthropist Chuck Feeney, whom Quintin hosted in Ireland. Feeney, the then-anonymous donor of The Atlantic Philanthropies, played an instrumental role behind the scenes in the Northern Ireland peace negotiations, including helping to bring the nonprofit sector into the peace process.
Quintin left NICVA to run the “Yes” campaign in the Good Friday Peace Agreement referendum, using the nonprofit community to translate the complex ideas of the negotiations into language that the average citizen could understand. The nonprofit sector became the “lightning conductor” for the negotiations, and it was able to create an intellectual space and time because of its perceived neutrality and ability to communicate. The campaign built on nonprofit organizations, which were more trusted than the politicians. The politicians couldn’t do it as easily.

Since then, Quintin has consulted on conflict resolution and peace referenda in 25 countries, including South Africa, Cyprus’s 2004 referendum, Israel/Palestine, the former Yugoslavia, Sri Lanka, Iraq, the Philippines, and the 2016 referendum on the peace process in Colombia; and is currently advising the Syrian National Opposition Coalition. He does much of this work as the Director of Stratagem (NI and International), which he established in 1998.

He also works as the Northern Ireland Advisor for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in England and set up the Northern Ireland Foundation, an operating foundation that works on reconciliation. He is currently refurbishing a Carnegie Library as a community center with his own funds, moving from activist to philanthropist in his own right.

He credits the intensive experience of the IFP as having shaped his career. It clearly did, but — once again — in unanticipated ways. Quintin blended the contacts he made through the Center with new concepts of the nonprofit sector to rethink its role in the peace process. Participating in the program also inspired him to shift careers, a common pattern among several of the Fellows. And, like many others, he subsequently grew from being a local manager to a global activist and authority, using the power of the nonprofit sector in new ways. Finally, like several of the baby boomer Fellows, he’s now experimenting with becoming a philanthropist himself by giving back to his original community.

**1991 Cohort: Hawaa El Tayeb Musa, Sudan**

Hawaa El Tayeb Musa came to the fellowship at age 25 as a development activist from Sudan, having worked with CARE International, Oxfam UK, and Save the Children – Canada. Her application noted the lack of African women participating in their own countries’ development, and her long term plans were to work for an international development nonprofit organization.

During her fellowship, Hawaa interned with InterAction, where she conducted a survey of approximately 40 private voluntary organizations as part of their Africa Partnerships Project. Her intention was to continue at the School for International Training in Vermont, where she was studying when she joined the Fellows Program.

Although she was very involved with her internship, she did not complete her IFP paper.

We did not reach Hawaa to participate in this study. An internet search found a reference to Hawaa El Tayeb, Liaison Officer at the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), with a photo suggesting it is the same person. Efforts were made to contact the UN DPKO and the School for International Training. The other Fellows in her cohort have not kept in touch with her.

Social and development NGO activists who participated in the program were less likely to stay involved with the Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society over time, including Hawaa. As the
IF program developed, it moved away from its original focus on NGOs to a greater emphasis on scholar/practitioners and those with an interest in philanthropy and civil society more generally, which decreased its relevance for NGO activists working in the field.

1991 Cohort: Maria del Rosario Leon Gallo, Peru

Rosario Leon was a researcher with the Asociación Multidisciplinaria de Investigación y Docencia en Población (AMIDEP) in Peru, focusing on issues of gender and development when she applied. A social worker by training, Rosario had also worked on community development and income generation projects as a Program Coordinator with Save the Children – Canada (Peru), and with local private voluntary organization in the shantytowns of Lima. Her application expressed a desire to study US international aid policies, research and analysis techniques, and other programs, projects and research models relating to women in economic development.

During her fellowship, she took a quantitative methods class, attended an InterAction conference in Annapolis, MD, and interned with the International Women’s Tribune, which broadened her understanding of women’s organizations. This gave her an opportunity to observe various types of women’s groups from a global perspective, and she initially intended to set up an NGO when she returned to Peru.

When she went back, Rosario shared what she had learned by organizing workshops on non-profit organizations with the local PVOs where she had previously worked, as well as with university students she taught.

Fundraising was another subject she studied in New York, and her IF contacts and training subsequently enabled her to secure a grant from the Ford Foundation for a book about women and income generation in Peru’s informal sector. Her in-depth interviews revealed how women used their earnings not just for the family but also for themselves, reshaping the division of labor and gender relations in the home. It also underscored the fact that income alone isn’t sufficient to reduce poverty; it also involves power relations and how people see themselves. Published at the start of the microcredit boom, her book was particularly well received.

Rosario subsequently moved to the Worldwide YWCA in Geneva in 1993. As she explained, the confidence, training and networking she received through the IFP were key assets for her job managing and fundraising for five programs, particularly her knowledge of how foundations worked from the inside. One of her colleagues there, Jung Rin Kim, a South Korean intern, later became a Fellow in 2000.

After seven years with the YWCA, Rosario joined the Kellogg Foundation’s Sao Paulo office, where she worked with Andrés Thompson from 2002 to 2004, and then served in a series of positions with ActionAid International from 2005-2011 in Brazil.

She currently works for a UK-based consultancy designing impact evaluations of the social aspects of infrastructure projects, including those of the World Bank. She sets up monitoring frameworks focusing on education, governance, capacity-building, and inclusive growth and finance, work that has taken her to 32 countries.

She plans to return to Latin America in the near future to continue working there, which she sees as an opportunity to give back.
As she explained in Milan, “The experience of being in New York and having access to information, resources, interaction with Fellows from other countries and with the staff at the Center and CUNY was one of the most stimulating experiences that I have had.”

Rosario credited the fellowship with contributing to her subsequent career choices. “I went back to Peru determined to focus my work as a researcher in an area that was very dear to me,” she noted, adding that the IFP also opened up new international dimensions.

Three aspects of the program, in particular, seem to have influenced her career and her contributions to the field. First, her IF research on women and her internship with the International Women’s Tribune strengthened her feminist credentials and broadened her understanding of that field. Second, her exposure to American fundraising techniques enabled her to get the Ford grant for her book on women, providing important credentials for her next job with the Worldwide YWCA. Third, her exposure to philanthropic models, practices and theories undoubtedly helped her to move to the Kellogg Foundation. And like Richard Ebil-Ottoo and Quintin Oliver, she’s now looking for ways to give back to her home community after a global civil society career.

**Learnings**

For the Center’s staff, one of the most interesting questions surrounding the program is how people learn. Another is what creates leaders rather than simply creating better managers. These questions are of particular importance in thinking about the design of a program that invests in individuals as a way to build an international field of practice.

All of the RBF Fellows were under 36, which meant that they had the bulk of their careers ahead of them. Perhaps the program’s strongest learning is the significance of unanticipated consequences. Some of the RBF Fellows enhanced their work in the field via the theoretical models they encountered; other drew their greatest gains from the internships and contacts garnered through the Center’s networks. While these gains were unanticipated at the start of the program, this long-term, retrospective view allows us to see that there was some predictability to what each Fellow took away from the experience. Andrés Thompson was a scholar who based his “aha” moment on theory coupled with observation; Noshir Dadrawala took the ideas and models he found here to broaden his role in shaping India’s philanthropic sector. Myrna Cacho, Quintin Oliver, Achintya Ghosh and Rosario Leon were experienced nonprofit and NGO practitioners. They derived more sustenance from contacts and internships. And all of them learned from being in a city with one of the world’s largest concentrations of nonprofits, foundations, corporations, and multinational organizations for four months.

Things that may seem irrelevant, peripheral or off the mark have often become the centerpiece of the Fellows’ careers a decade later, which is one of the benefits of training people at an early stage in their professional development. For example, the first 1989 cohort of Fellows staged a mutiny, briefly refusing to attend John Palmer Smith’s courses because they felt they were too American. Years later, Professor Smith was invited to Latin America to teach the same course. These unanticipated consequences are also a side benefit of exposing them to a wide array of experiences, models and ideas, which helps to broaden their thinking from how to move paper off one’s desk most efficiently to how to change the world.
There was also a multiplier effect that could not have been foreseen when the program started. Andrés mentored several Latin American Fellows, identifying them, encouraging them to apply, and helping to raise funds to bring them in. He also forged a career that spanned every corner of the sector, studying it, working as a foundation leader, creating his own network of Fellows, a new foundation, and a publication, working in nonprofits, and as a grassroots activist spurring new kinds of philanthropic activities at the local level.

The one thing that all of the Fellows gained was a global perspective, which was embedded in the program’s mission from the outset. And several of the RBF Fellows went on to become pioneers in the regionalization and globalization of modern philanthropy and the nonprofit sphere.

Conclusions

The RBF cohorts were appointed when the globalization of modern philanthropy was in its infancy. As a result, the program’s impact on their careers was often more sharply etched than it would be with later Fellows, who were part of a more critical mass of local, national, regional and international institutions and people in the field.

All were baby boomers, the same generation that launched the “associational revolution” of NGOs around the world. Some, like Andrés Thompson, were student radicals and political refugees, as were many of the NGO leaders who created new institutions after they were shut out of business and government jobs due to their roles in public protests.

Two came from vibrant philanthropic cultures, Noshir Dadrawala, who was affiliated with the Tata family’s philanthropic activities in Mumbai; and Myrna Cacho from the Association of Foundations in the Philippines.

Most of the others knew far more about NGOs than philanthropy when they arrived, continuing to make their strongest contributions in this part of the sector. And some, including Andrés Thompson, Rosario Leon, Quintin Oliver and Myrna Cacho, broached the two, spinning off a string of new institutions and initiatives over the course of their careers.

Others chose utterly unconventional paths, like Richard Ebil-Ottoo, who became an American academic, made a bid for the presidency of Uganda, and continues to work with Ugandan NGOs. And several shifted their careers after the fellowship ended, often because of the ways in which their perspectives changed during the program, pursuing broader national, regional and international goals within the sector.

In the beginning, the program was broadly etched enough to accommodate a wide array of objectives, and many of the Fellows subsequently left an enduring imprint on philanthropy and NGOs around the globe.

Donors often feel that they have to make a choice between funding individuals and institutions. One of the most important lessons from the Fellows Program is that the two are not mutually exclusive: individuals can and do improve existing institutions and found new ones, shaping the sector in constantly expanding ways.
Appendix 1: A Note on Methodology

The methodology blended a variety of methods to ensure that we captured the fullest possible portrait of the Fellows’ careers.

Winnowing the extent to which the IFP shaped the Fellows’ careers can be difficult, since many factors shape peoples’ lives, their professional choices and their contributions to a given field. With that in mind, we focused on four criteria in particular:

1) The extent to which the program changed Fellows’ understanding of philanthropy;
2) The extent to which it inspired them to create new institutions;
3) Any research that they might have done as a result of the program; and,
4) The extent to which they or their institutions changed their behaviors or priorities as a result of their participation in the program.

We started with an updated survey, sent out to the Fellows who are profiled in this impact study, asking them to include their name, birth year, country and cohort, so that their responses could be a basis for follow-up discussions. Of the nine RBF-funded Fellows profiled here, seven filled out the survey. Interviews were conducted with six of the Fellows, and three of these Fellows also participated in a focus group or other group discussion among alumni. We were unable to make contact with two of the original nine RBF Fellows, Hawaa El Tayeb Musa and Regina Domingues da Silva.

To measure the Fellows’ roles in the globalization of philanthropy, we traced the trajectory of their careers over the long term. We combed through the Fellows’ original applications, research papers, updates from the Fellows in the years immediately following their fellowship, previous interviews and surveys, and research and publications. These materials were supplemented by CVs, LinkedIn profiles, and internet searches to identify publications, interviews in the press, and materials on various organizations with which they were involved over the course of their careers. Particular attention was paid to the years immediately bracketing their appointment: what they were doing before they came, the focus of their research and other fellowship activities, and their career paths in the ensuing two to three years. This illustrates the immediate outcomes of their research, recommendations for action, and networking through the Center.

Given the difficulty of isolating specific contributions of the IFP to individuals’ careers, we encouraged the Fellows to identify, in their own words, the learnings from the fellowship that have stayed with them over time and contributed to their thinking and careers. We have quoted the Fellows directly about the contribution of the IFP to their careers wherever possible.

Previous Aggregate Evaluations

CPCS conducted aggregate surveys of all its alumni in 2004, 2008, and 2014. These studies tracked several key indicators, including the Fellows’ roles in founding institutions, publishing, serving on nonprofit boards, and networking. The surveys were sent out electronically to all of
the alumni for whom we had email addresses, and all had response rates of at least 50%. In addition to the survey results, the final reports included quotes from the Fellows to illuminate the program’s influence on their careers.

Briefly, the 2004 survey found that 61 of the program’s 83 alumni (as of that time) had continued to work in the civil society sector. Of these, 36% were in foundations or foundation-like organizations; 31% in NGOs; 20% in research or academia; and 13% in support organizations, 70% of whom were in managerial positions. The survey also found that slightly less than one-half of the Fellows had published, and 39% had given presentations on civil society topics in the previous five years.

The 2008 update found that 73% of the 108 respondents (out of 118 alumni) had participated in the founding of at least one civil society organization (82 organizations in total). Of these, 63% felt that their fellowship aided them in creating these organizations. A total of 69% were employed in the third sector, while 90% of those working in business were in corporate social responsibility programs, and 75% of those in the public sector were engaged with nonprofit organizations as part of their professional responsibilities.

Additionally, 69% of the respondents had published works on third sector topics, and 68% indicated that their publications originated from research undertaken during their fellowship. An impressive 90% had given a presentation on third sector topics, and 87% acknowledged a link between the fellowship and their presentations, while 83% reported maintaining the professional contacts they had established during their fellowship. Perhaps the 2008 report’s most striking finding was the role of the IFP alumni in the sector’s growth around the world. High levels of employment in the sector, sustained intellectual production, networking and 82 organizations created by a handful of individuals over the past few years all spoke to the program’s impact.

By 2014, 82 (of a total of 191 alumni) who responded to that year’s survey had helped to create at least 98 foundations, community organizations, support organizations and nonprofit research groups. Of the respondents, 64% reported that they had participated in the founding of organizations, 30% of which were community philanthropies, 44% civil society support organizations, 13% other philanthropies, and 36% other types of nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, 37% of the survey respondents attributed the founding of these organizations to their time as a Fellow. That is, 30 Fellows used their time in New York to hone their thinking about founding new organizations and/or were inspired to put their ideas into praxis on their return home.

We also asked about their impact on the field. According to survey information collected in 2014 on whether there was any specific way that the field of community philanthropy or the wider third sector had gained from their fellowship, 69% of the respondents replied. Their answers fell into several categories: through sharing their findings in presentations and publications and with colleagues; bolstering their roles at an organization; contributing to the field more generally in their countries; connecting to international networks; and specific concepts or topics that enriched their work. A few felt their fellowship was too recent or otherwise were not able to comment. As for the ways the fellowship advanced their careers, 71% of the 2014 respondents identified a range of broad-based impacts, including: deepened knowledge; prestige and confidence; a broadened perspective; and opportunities for international networking.
The International Fellows are a prolific bunch, in large part because of their time at CPCS. Of the 82 respondents in 2014, 65% had published on civil society or third sector topics since 2000, and half said that at least one of these publications resulted from their time as a Fellow. Similar to 2008, 90% had given at least one third sector presentation, and of those who responded to the question, 63% had given 10 or more presentations, and 85% percent said that their presentations resulted from their time as a Fellow.

It’s clear that these impacts helped to shape the global third sector, as demonstrated by the Fellows’ long tenure and prominent positions in the field. Of those who responded, 65% have been working in the sector for 10 years or more, 20% have been in the field for 6-9 years, and just 15% have been in the field for 5 years or less, including recent cohorts of younger Fellows. Regarding their current positions, 58% were in senior managerial positions, 26% were mid-level managers, 15% worked in research or policy, and the remaining respondents were founders, board members, specialists or consultants. Furthermore, the Fellows have contributed not just to the organizations where they are employed, but a large portion also participates in additional organizations in the field. A full 69% of survey respondents said they were involved in other non-profit organizations, community foundations, philanthropies or support organizations, beyond their employer.

International networking was mentioned as both a key impact of the fellowship on their careers and on the field as a whole: 80% of the survey respondents reported maintaining professional contacts with individuals and organizations they met during their fellowship. Of the survey respondents, 70% stayed in touch with Fellows from their cohort, and 68% kept in touch with Fellows from other cohorts. When asked to comment on the main benefits of contacts with former Fellows, 72% identified the importance of sharing experiences, knowledge and information about the field, including new developments in other countries that might benefit their work. Many also cited the importance of solidarity and friendship for needed support, advice and encouragement when working in isolation. Others mentioned the significance for future collaboration and career advice, and 39% of the respondents noted that these relationships had led to collaborative projects, joint research, publications and workshops.

**The 2016-2017 Survey**

The 2016-2017 survey targeted only those Fellows who attended the Milan conference or who are profiled in the impact studies. Furthermore, it was not done anonymously, in order to use it as a jumping off point for deeper conversations about what the Fellows had gained from the IFP over time. The response rate was quite high: seven of the nine RBF-funded Fellows profiled here responded to our survey, all of whom reported working in the third sector for 10 or more years, and all are currently in managerial positions or higher. Five of the seven reported having helped to establish foundations and/or NGO support organizations, four of which were a direct result of the IFP. Six published their IF research, and five gave presentations based on it. These numbers are in line with the full IFP responses in the 2014 survey.