

IUPUI

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives
Indianapolis

Oral History Project
on
Men and Women in Philanthropy

Interviewee:
Sara Gould

Interviewer:
Andrea K. Pactor

Date of interview:
April 18, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical information	
First experiences with philanthropy and family philanthropy	2
Personal definition of philanthropy	3
Role models for philanthropy	7
Ms. Foundation for Women	8
Future of collaborative funding	17
Sustainability of funding for women	25
Women's funds in the larger picture of philanthropy	26
Women's funds in the public policy arena	29
Future of foundation philanthropy	32
Leadership	33
Challenges and opportunities for the women's funding landscape	37

Sara Gould

AP All right. Well today is Wednesday the 18th and it's 3:35 and I'm sitting in the beautiful 33rd floor offices of the Ms. Foundation for Women. This is Andrea Pactor and I'm sitting with Sara Gould, the President and CEO of the Ms. Foundation for Women and this is an oral history interview for the University Library. It will be housed in the Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives. Hello, Sara.

SG Hello, Andrea.

AP How are you doing today?

SG I'm doing great.

AP Great. Well, we'll just get started right away and just warm the waters a little bit with what your first memories of philanthropy are.

SG Well, my first memories of philanthropy would definitely be associated with my grandparents. I grew up in a small town in Michigan called Grand Haven on Lake Michigan—about 12,000 people. My family were industrialists if you will. In my mother's family there's a business called The Challenge Machinery Company which was founded in late 1800's and moved to Grand Haven in 1900. So my family has been in Grand Haven a long time. And there was some wealth in my family, not huge wealth because the only asset was this company. My grandparents never diversified their holdings at all but it produced some wealth. So my grandparents were very philanthropic and that's where I learned about it.

They gave to the church. They gave to universities or colleges. I have five brothers and sisters that all went to college. They were quite connected to Alma College, which is a small Presbyterian school. My grandmother gave to the Salvation Army. But they also were leaders in

the community. They gave to the YMCA and they...it's where I learned a lot about both leadership and philanthropy and in some ways I saw them as connected.

AP You have a first experience from being a young child....

SG Oh yeah, I do. The first money that I—I was nine years old, I think—either nine or 11, when the mayor of Grand Haven who was also our dentist, our family dentist, his name is Bill Creason. He in World War II had served, I believe, overseas in Europe and I think in France or Germany he saw this fountain that completely impressed him and he came back to Grand Haven. And when he became mayor he put forward the project to build Grand Haven Musical Fountain at the end of Washington Street across the Grand River. And he did build the Grand Haven Musical Fountain. And I was so taken and it's there to this day. People come from all around to see the Grand Haven Musical Fountain. And I was so taken with his leadership with him saying the city needs this, it will put us on the map; it will draw people. I really got involved in it and I went door to door in Grand Haven in my little neighborhood and I raised, I think the amount was \$11.53. And my picture was on the front page of the Grand Haven Tribune as an 11 year old, giving this \$11.53 to Dr. Creason. So that was my first fundraising experience and really my first philanthropic experience.

AP That's a great recollection. From that and the experiences that you have had since then, are you able to put together a personal definition of philanthropy?

SG Yeah, for me philanthropy has to do with generosity, with giving of your spirit, as well as your material resources and philanthropy is of all sizes and shapes in terms of sizes and gifts or the shape that the gift takes, whether the gift is financial or some other kind of gift. Um, but it's a giving of yourself for the betterment of humanity.

AP What would your personal philanthropic values be?

SG Um, I have deep philanthropic values by giving to people who don't have as much as I do. I think because of my experience growing up in an upper middle class family, in a town where I saw, you know where I was from a family that was an employer...so my friends or people in my high school—since I possibly wasn't friends with—but anyway their parents were employed in my parents' business. I have—I developed early—and also because I'm one of six children. There are three boys and then there are 3 girls and I am the oldest girl, and we're all only nine years apart in age. And again because of the dynamic of this family business which was a male dominated business even though in my mother's family. Um, when I say male dominated I mean it's a heavy machinery business, so the workers were men. And so I developed early a keen sense of unfairness. I could see who had resources and who didn't. I could see in my own family that it was my mother's family that owned this business but actually my father and my grandfather, you know then it passed father to son, father to son. I can see that I had three older brothers who could have a place in the business if they wanted it but I absolutely couldn't—only by virtue of being a girl. And so I recognized all of that and also in my town almost entirely white, no black families lived in the town, but there were a couple of black families that were close enough that one or two kids were in the school system and I could see how ostracized they were and I knew racism in that way. And there was one Jewish family in Grand Haven and racism in the way or with not racism, but you know what I mean. So my values are a lot about equality and they're a lot about bringing up people—in bringing people from the bottom so to speak into the mainstream and also the value of the experience, the lived experience of people who have a different life experience than my own. And that their life experience is as valid and as important for us to consider as a society as my life experience.

AP Did your values influence your place of employment?

SG Yes, easily.

AP But in a personal vein in your own family, who makes the decision about giving? How are those decisions made and what informs them?

SG Well, I'm married. This is my second marriage but I have been married about 24 years and I have one son who's 14 almost 15. And my husband is a Jewish man, grew up on Staten Island and not married until he married me at the age of 35. And also very driven by the same kind of personal values that I hold. Very driven by trying to—very driven by a sense of justice. About trying to create a more just world and an equitable world. So that being said, I happen to control the finances in the family. I pay the bills. I do all of that and we are philanthropic as a couple. There are some philanthropic decisions that I make and there are some that we talk about together. And I would like to say we talk about all of this together but that's not really true. So, I think I have taken more of the lead and Rick has more followed my lead on what we give money to. And we give a lot of money to the Ms. Foundation. We give a lot of money, not as much money to his, his – he's been involved in developing things around people with disabilities. He runs an organization dedicated to the independence of people with disabilities. So we give some money to that and then our philanthropic... then has been to give smaller amounts of money to lots of organizations. Because I like to get information about a lot of organizations and the way that they do their work, etc. So I make small contributions and receive literature back and things like that. And then, really, the only major philanthropic commitment that we've made has been to the Ms. Foundation.

AP And then the logical follow-up to that is the next generation.

SG Yeah.

AP What kind of role models do you think that you provide for your son?

SG Right, Right. Well, certainly we provide I think really strong role models about—around justice and equality. As I described, I come from a Christian background and Rick from a Jewish background but both of us really feel secular in those backgrounds, although when I was young I was not secular. I was very involved in our church, etc. But as an adult I have been much more secular. And so you know how quickly time can go by when you have children. You can talk about this and all of a sudden they've grown up. And that is pretty much what happened with Jacob. So Jacob has not been raised in any religious tradition. He certainly is aware of our backgrounds. And because we had him when we were in our forties, all my siblings had already had their children. So Jacob also doesn't have close relationships with cousins. So he really hasn't come into the sort of larger you know religious network. And so he would say he's an atheist. But he would also—he's been raised with deep values around justice—and humanistic values of the value about giving to and doing for and empowering people who have less that you do. Where he's going to go with that in his life, I don't know. But he'll be able—he'll say to me for instance—you know if it's something in popular culture—he'll say to me, "Mom, what you won't like about this is x, y and z." And so he's finely calibrated around those things, but I don't really have a sense yet where he's going to take them in his own life. Is he one of those kids who at 15 wants to come and volunteer or uh...he did call me from school about a month ago to say that he was going to go to an anti-war rally. Could he leave school to go to an anti-war rally and I said I didn't think you were against the war. Because actually we've been having all these conversations at home about—because he's been studying in history the Middle East—and it's taken him—mainly they have been studying Israel and Palestine, but they've been looking at the whole region. So it's been taking him to think about the Iraq war. And he definitely would not have started the Iraq war but now that we're in it, I don't think he's quite sure what the best

course of action would be in his mind. Should we pull out? Should we stay in and just get the job done. I know he's been thinking about those things, but he did call to say that he wanted to go to this anti-war rally and I said you can. I want you to bring me—I want you to get some literature there. I want you to tell me what it's like. You know, I want to know what actually happened at this rally. So he did decide to go and he was able to talk about it.

AP You mentioned a little earlier about your grandparents being philanthropic role models and their involvement within Grand Haven, Michigan. Can you think of any other philanthropic role models—maybe those others within your family or people that you've encountered along your...

SG Yeah, yeah, well you know my mother and father of course would also be, but not quite in the same way. My mother was an alcoholic when I was growing up from age 5 to 13 and you know this was in 1958 to 1963 or something like that when women being alcoholics wasn't recognized. And so she joined AA in 1963. She was the only woman in Grand Haven, Michigan in AA. And my mother was a very giving person. She passed away in 1981. But she was incredibly philanthropic. She had some, she had some financial resources but she was mostly philanthropic in how she gave of her own time. And she—and the way that she got involved in other people's lives and in helping them, etc. And so that definitely was a role model for me. And my dad did fundraising for the YMCA, not YWCA. My dad was kind of a community leader, so I saw that. But then in our town also there were wealthier families, the Johnsons – like Dottie Johnson who's a well known person to you Andrea, she was...my grandmother was a mentor to Dottie Johnson in Grand Haven and Dottie was in some ways a mentor to me, although our politics were so different that we never kind of clicked on that level. But I very much admire everything Dottie has done and certainly saw her as a role model for a

woman who was very—was independent and was doing work on her own and happened to be about philanthropy. So, and then I didn't see myself working in a foundation, not at all. And I didn't even see myself doing women's work. I studied in community economic development and only stumbled on the fact that I ended up giving my life to this. And I stumbled on it because I graduated with a degree in city and regional planning and went to work with CDCs in Massachusetts. And something was latently nagging at me because I wasn't very—I was enjoying it but it just, it was like—I don't know that this is quite it. And then I thought I'll go back to school to become a therapist. And then I got called because of networking—I got a call that the Women's Action Alliance here in New York in 1983 was starting a project on women's economic development and they had six months of funding. Well, I had applied to go back to graduate school so I thought it's perfect, I'll come into New York City and do this project. My mother had died about a year and half before. I was, you know, kind of—I was looking for something else. And so I came to do that—and bingo. It was like as soon as I was focusing on women in economic development, that was like okay. This is 'I'm not going to go back to school to become a therapist', this is what I really want to do. And then I found the Ms. Foundation. You know I don't think I would have gone into any philanthropy. I was practicing in my field of economic development but then Ms. [Foundation] wanted to start up a project. And even before that I—the Women's Action Alliance and Ms.—were in the same building on 41st Street or 43rd, I think, no 41st going south, and anyway, I went to that floor and visited the Ms. Foundation when it had four employees. And I thought to myself at that point, that's where I have to be because they have connections to women's organizations all over the country and that's who I want to work with. So I sort of stumbled into the Foundation because of the economic development work. And for the first 10 years I wouldn't have, I wouldn't have even

identified myself, even here at Ms., I mean I knew I was in philanthropy but I was doing economic development with women. And now sometimes I say to myself, I don't even know what my field is anymore. Because I have been out of that field long enough that it's not that and--but what has it become? I don't know. You know—is philanthropy a field, is women's philanthropy a field? It brings up all those questions.

AP That leads us to the next section of our conversation which is about this funding landscape and women's funds and the fact that by virtually having been here for almost 22 years, you do have a perspective and a history. And the Ms. Foundation is 35 years old in 2008. You've been on staff since 1986 and President since 2004 so you've had a lot of different roles with this organization. Would you please share your impressions of the evolution from moving out of being focused on issue areas to the more inclusive strategy and how that affects your work?

SG Yeah, so the Foundation—I'll do just a little, just a little evolution of the Foundation as a whole. When I came—well, the Foundation was founded in 1972 by the four founding mothers of Ms. Magazine – Letty Pogrebin, Marlo Thomas, Gloria Steinem and Pat Carbine. Their vision when they founded the magazine [was] that there should be a foundation that would distribute the profits of the magazine to the women's movement. Remember it was 1972 and the women's movement was really moving. And the problem was that the magazine never made any profit. So fairly quickly they reorganized the magazine under the Foundation. They reorganized the magazine as a non-profit activity of the Foundation. But it left them the problem of where was the money going to come from for the foundation. So the first money that came was “Free to be You and Me”—the proceeds of that—Marlo Thomas' project. And then they began to raise money from foundations, from other foundations, and the first foundation money was from

the John Hay Whitney Foundation here in New York City—under a category called “powerlessness,” which I think is kind of ironic. And then they continued to raise money from some individuals, although never large groups of individuals throughout the seventies— or large gifts from individuals. When I came in ‘83 and I said I went to visit the Ms. Foundation, you know, it was a small operation. They had four or five staff and it was giving away, I don’t know the number, but it can’t have been giving away more than half a million dollars a year. And then Marie [Wilson] came—and the Foundation did have executive directors before Marie—it had four of them. And the one just previous to her was Julia Scott who went on to lead The National Black Women’s Health Project. But when Julia decided to resign and the Board went out to hire somebody, that’s when they hired Marie who came from Iowa—and came with this enormous vision. Marie is an extraordinarily visionary person and she really had a vision for the foundation growing. And it did. So from ‘80—she came in ‘85—I met her later that year. By ‘86, I was here and she took philanthropy by storm when she came to New York City. It was a different time then. She did have this large vision and she began to raise money immediately—just almost by walking into a room. And I know because I had the experience of walking into some of these rooms with her. And so—but it’s interesting because we still had just one grant making program here. It was called The Grants Program and the person who ran it was the field director interestingly enough because it was about—we were even in ‘85—there were lots and lots of women’s’ organizations around the country that didn’t even know about the Ms. Foundation. So even then we would take trips out into regions of the country to find out what was going on there and so organizations could talk to the Ms. Foundation. And so there was just one grant making program. I came on in ‘86 and I didn’t make any grants. I wasn’t involved in grant making until 1991. So what was I doing? This is where the “more than money” piece

actually starts to come in because the Foundation already had been running a technical assistance project. I don't really know a lot about it but my impression is that it had a lot—it was mainly focused around reproductive health organizations. But when I came in, I started to go out into the country and to meet these organizations that Ms. was funding in the area of economic development, which were not very many, and then a lot of other organizations that Ms. wasn't yet funding. Then I organized regional meetings. For two years we held regional meetings and we held about 12 or 14 of them around the country that brought together all kinds of women's organizations in the region. And again, this was at a time when the words "woman" and "economic development" didn't appear in the same sentence. If you were talking about women and their economic circumstances you were talking about the welfare system. And if you were talking about economic development you were talking about white men. So, but I knew from again my economic development background and what I really wanted to do. I knew that these organizations were involved in economic development—at least as I defined it—because it has to do with the redistribution of economic resources. And so we held sort of Freirean type regional meetings where we bring together say 75 women and we sort of posed questions to them in small group settings. You know, 'what do you think economic development is?' Just like you said to me, 'what do you think philanthropy is?' What do you see in your town that's called economic development? Do you think that's economic development? Who do you think is benefiting from it? Who isn't benefiting from it? And slowly over a two day period, lead them to the point where they would say 'I am doing economic development. My organization – oh yes I see it now.' And so then very rapidly over this two year period, we did all these meetings and you know it's like a buzz was starting. A buzz was going around in certain networks and communities. And I did a lot of public speaking during that time, but within three years I wasn't

being called on nearly as much to do public speaking because the women themselves who were doing the work at the grassroots level, they got it and they now were the experts in it. And you didn't need an intermediary kind of person like myself.

So then we started the Institute for Women's Economic Development and that was in '88 and we started it under the Tufts University umbrella. And that brought together--because our class at Tufts on women in economic development—and this was a management and community development institute that they were doing. Our class on women's economic development was the largest enrolled class so the guy who ran that—Richard Schramm—said to me, “Sara, you know, you ought to start your own institute and I'll help you to do it.” So, in '88 we started that under the Tufts umbrella and that was again nationwide, not just our grantees. It was all about this value added, about peer learning and the power of peer learning, and networking, and bringing resources in so that organizations could take greater leaps forward.

Then in about '89, Marie and I looked at each other and said, “Well, we are a foundation and we have now met all of these organizations across the country that are operating on a shoestring in the field of economic development, so we really ought to do something about that.” And we consulted with a woman in California named Paulette Meyer and Paulette said, “Well, you could do the typical thing that funders do, you know hold a funders' briefing or, you know, put out some literature about this, or you could start a collaborative fund.” You know we could design—what about if we said Ms. wants to have a table in this new field of work – micro-enterprise. Everybody needs to learn. There's a lot of practice that is happening and nobody is coordinating it. Nobody is really learning from it. And funders feel a lot of risk in this area. Well, why not lower your risk and hugely upscale your opportunity to learn from one another by pooling money? And Ms. knows this field better than anybody. So pool it at Ms. Foundation

and then we'll work together to make the grants and we'll work together to learn afterward. So that's the concept. And we took Paulette's idea, we thought it was great, and we developed the Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development, which our idea was we thought, well okay, we want to pull in \$3 million dollars – this was in 1990 and we'll do it this way. We're going to get four anchor funders of half a million each and then that third million we'll get from some smaller players. But even the smallest player has to not be that small because you can't amass money if you're going to take it in \$10,000 increments. So we said you got to put down at least \$50,000 a year to play at this table. And so we went out to get the four anchors. We wanted Ford; we got Ford. We wanted MacArthur; we ended up finally getting MacArthur. We wanted Pew; Pew wouldn't even talk to us and because I think we were too radical, and we wanted Rockefeller and Rockefeller didn't want in this conversation either. So we ended up with really more like two anchor donors and then we got a lot more smaller partners. We got the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, we got Levi Strauss Foundation. You know how when you're raising money that you get—sometimes it's just serendipitous—you're at the right place at the right moment, and other times you're getting the money because it totally corresponds with what their interest areas are. So we got some of both of those things. And we ended up not amassing \$3 million but amassing I think around \$2.3 million. And then, 13 partners, all of which were institutions—no individuals yet. And so then we facilitated—'we' being me—we facilitated this process where we developed a set of guidelines and everyone at the table agreed to the guidelines. The Ms. Foundation put them out in the world. We got back over 300 letters of inquiry. And we weeded through them as the Ms. staff and then we brought to the donor partners as we call them, 33 that we thought we should get full proposals from. And we also

brought them data on the whole field. Because when you get 300 letters of inquiry across the US, you've got a pretty good look at the field.

So we took a look at that and then the people. The donor partners discussed the proposals we got and we decided how many we wanted to site visit. And again this is all around the objective of learning. You know, those of us around the table are learning. And we decided to site visit 22. So we organized like 6 or 7 or 8 weeks of trips and donor partners went. Some went on one trip, some went on three trips. Ms. went everywhere. And then we came back together after we made all the trips and we spent a day together and now our questions to the partners around the table were, well: What did you see? Did you like it? Didn't you like it? Was it what you expected? What did you learn? And now that you've been there, would you fund them? And then, at the end of that day, we made our grant decisions. So then we were crafting a national docket, so we wanted geographical representation, we wanted issue area representation, constituency, strategy—and so by the end of that day, talking back and forth, we had come to—and we made 15 grants. This is the first time that the Ms. Foundation made multi-year grants and big grants. They were \$50,000 a year for three years. So it was historic on the landscape for the Ms. Foundation. And that was a very proud moment. So from 1991 to 1994 those grants lived out. And also you know now in philanthropy you can find collaborative funds on everything, on every street corner, but they didn't exist then. We really pioneered it here at Ms. And so the people were taking notice. And so during that period we—at toward the end of it—we were thinking okay, let's do this again. This was good. And we went out to recapitalize the fund and we did. And instead of \$2.3 we brought in \$3.5 million dollars. And now that worked with a few individual donors around the table. And now instead of us having to call everybody to say—'You want to be in the collaborative fund?' to raise the money—some people

are actually calling us. And saying we heard about that – this collaborative fund – and we were really interested in women’s economic development and can we join. It was like--YES you can! So that was the second round. And during that period at the Foundation is when ‘Take our Daughters to Work’ started in 1993. And that led us into having girls’ programming, which included then a collaborative fund in girls, which at first was called The Healthy Girls/ Healthy Women Collaborative Fund. And then become a Collaborative Fund for Youth Led Social Change.

Meanwhile, so you’re getting towards the late ‘90s and we went to recapitalize the third round of the Collaborative Fund for Women’s Economic Development. And in 1999, I think we did recapitalize; it was \$5 million dollars. Well, this was the moment in philanthropy that money was literally pouring out the doors because the dotcoms and all that sort of stuff. So—and economic development being the field that it was—it was a perfect field to catch some of this money, so we actually got up to \$5 million dollars. The girls’ work, on the other hand, didn’t—wasn’t the issue area to capture this money because it’s gendered. You know it’s more gendered than women’s economic development. So it was attracting some money. We did build a table around girls. And you can hear in this like how deeply siloed. So the Foundation goes from—in the beginning of the ‘90s—having one common grant program, to the end of the 90’s having several specific silos. One is economic development; one is girls; one is reproductive health; one is Women & AIDS – that had started in ‘96; one is ending violence against women. One is, I think also by that time, or maybe it was later, that sex-ed came under the screen because Packard wanted to do a big project. But you know, so now we were siloed; there was no general grants program anymore because we didn’t have the source of money for it. So all of a sudden we were doing much more grant making but the source of the money for that grant making was restricted

into fields. And you know, I think the story of philanthropy at that time was the field story. It was, you know, it was deep knowledge in fields. Whereas after you pass 9/11 and as we go farther forward into the 21st century, to me the story as we stand in social justice philanthropy, it's not deep knowledge in fields. It's, you know, we're in a tough situation here and what are we going to do about it? How are we going to make the world a better place?

So that has led to us now saying our vision is about being able to bring the power of the Ms. Foundation to all—you know—the burning questions of our time, so to speak. And I don't really mean all of them but we're not thinking in terms of women's issues. We think it's about women's leadership on every issue that our society is facing. And we, the Ms. Foundation, are going to take on some of those issues but in a much more holistic way. So we want to—and we have a particular talent at building and we think it's very important—how do you take on issues? You build power. You build constituency power at the grass roots. And we're good at doing that. We have done that for years. And that's where we're going to focus on building more and more constituency power at the grass roots. To actually bring about the kind of policy change that we want to see, whether it's paid sick time or whether it's, you know... Unfortunately, I just read—I don't know if you've heard this, but the Supreme Court upheld the partial birth abortion law today. Uh, so that's got, you know, there's work to be done there. And or whether it's about policy about, you know, HIV health policy around HIV. We're taking that on right now with our grantees in HIV, who have formed into actually a very strong “collective” they call themselves. And they would not exist without the fact that the Ms. Foundation has funded this little nascent movement, these small really kitchen table organizations, for the last 10 years. And now they're taking on the CDC because they think the CDC doesn't have the right definition of at-risk groups for contracting HIV. So in that way the Ms. Foundation, we say now, you know, funds

movements and invigorates or reinvigorates movements in communities and among constituencies where most funders don't go. And that's the role we're going to play. It will sometimes be by taking on an issue area; it will sometimes be by taking on a region of the country or an event. We've been very involved with Katrina. And I think we'll expand that involvement to a southern strategy, the southern US. But we won't be so deeply—we won't organize our thinking around issue areas. We'll organize our thinking more around problems to be solved and how can we bring the most power to solving those problems.

AP You talked a little bit about the '90's being a time when the collaborative funding was really very strong. Does that environment still exist?

SG Well, it does now in philanthropy. I think that there are still—there are many active collaborative funds. It's been much harder for us in our collaborative funds in the last several years—last few years really—because of, I think, because of the fields they're in. Meaning it's always been a bit of a struggle around the girls work. But particularly because even when we changed it to youth work, it's about youth organizing and just as we were getting that collaborative fund started—a non-gendered, if you will, youth organizing collaborative started up. It just happened that way. And because I believe it was non-gendered but was deeply about race and class and ours was deeply about race and class also—but also about gender—the money flowed to them. The bigger institutional money. And it has grown. It's grown so much—it used to be housed at the Jewish Funds for Justice and now has its own 501(C)(3). So I know that we've...that's been a bit of a rub for us. Because some funders—a couple of funders—are at both tables and they see that—they understand that—but most funders choose one or another table and frankly they have tended to choose the other one.

Economic development, this field of micro enterprise—you know when we started it was the beginning of the development of a field in the US and now it's 20 years later and most people have decided this works or it doesn't work. And there are fewer funders who are funding in this area. So we are at the fourth round of that collaborative fund but we've only been, we've been able to bring less than \$2 million dollars into the fourth round from four partners. Only four and there were in the third round—there were 34 different partners around the table. So that's dramatic change.

I think that the concept of collaborative funding still has a great deal of merit. I'd like—I think it continues to have merit for us as our endowment grows and we now have a \$28 million endowment. And as our endowment as a huge source of unrestricted funds for us and that's what we need and then other unrestricted gifts that we can get. If we can put more of our own money on the table to start something, that gives us more leverage in the collaborative fund. Then I can see, but I don't want the Foundation to be stuck in a place where we put a lot of focus on raising restricted dollars because I don't want us to be stuck in a place where we can't be pro-active or even responsive without going out to some number of donors to raise the money before we can act.

AP Well you were very successful in creating the Democracy Funding Circle at the Ms. Foundation and has that been able to bring in dollars, new donors?

SG Uh-huh it has. That's the circle that's all individuals. They are not institutions at that table. And it started with very—there had been a prior circle here at the Ms. Foundation, an individual circle called the Safety Circle. And it was women who were women of wealth who for one reason or another were interested in the issue of ending violence against women and particularly issues around sexual abuse. And some of the women were survivors themselves,

some were not, but anyway that's how the circle formed. And so they met for a few years—like maybe three or four years and then a woman named Jean Hardisty in Boston who is a former board member of the Ms. Foundation. Jean is the founder of PRA – Political Research Associates, which is located in Boston. And Jean is one of the foremost experts in the US on the growth of the right wing in this country. And understands it deeply and has a very nuanced understanding of it in analysis. She is a donor herself, not a large one but a small one. And Jean is in a lot of networks of women donors. So I don't really know how this happened. I was at the foundation but I wasn't involved in it at that time. Somehow the Safety Circle became the Democracy Funding Circle. And Jean became a pivotal player because a number of women donors wanted to know what Jean knew. You know it was 1996 I guess or whatever it was and the right wing was more visible in the US and growing. And Jean was alerting people to this, if you will. And some women were very interested in this. So I think Jean brought to us the idea that we form the Democracy Funding Circle. They played with calling it instead the Fight the Right Circle and decided to call it the Democracy Funding Circle, which I'm very glad they did. And so it really was a bit, it was, it had a little bit of groupie feeling to it around Jean. You know and Jean being former Ms. Foundation board member and huge supporter of this—meaning a philosophical supporter or small financial supporter but a huge philosophical supporter. That was fine with us. But it was very clear that there was a personal relationship. So then this was another mistake we made with all these collaborative funds and circles. We, it took us too long to realize that we should be, because we were so deeply siloed. It took us too long to realize that we should be showing people who were in then the whole Foundation. We weren't. We had people who were, who would say—Oh, yes. People would say they knew the Ms. Foundation—yes, I'm a member of the Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development. Yes I'm in

the Democracy Funding Circle. What else does the Ms. Foundation do? I don't know. I don't have a clue. So if we, by the late '90s we were, we had our first probably individual giving officer here and she was the one who said—'Holy Moses.' We said to her, 'Your charge is to bring in more individual donors.' And she said, 'Have you looked at who's already here?' And realized, uh no, we haven't. So she helped us to see who was already in, who was around these tables we had formed, and that brought us board members. We brought on Rob McKay from the McKay Foundation because he was in the Economic Development Collaborative. Lindsay Shea was in both of those. Andrea Stern, who didn't remain a board member for all that long, but she was in the Girls' Collaborative. And then we started to ask them for general support gifts. Which of course they were happy to give. We simply had never asked them before. So the Democracy Funding Circle had a kind of precious feeling to it, you know, and even to this day I don't think we've done a much better job of the circle members there. There are two or three, probably three or four of circle members who give significant—for us significant general support gifts as well as \$25,000 they put down on the table to be in the circle. But they still feel quite highly identified with the circle. And that I, I think that's great because we've, you know, we—it's another form of very high donor engagement. And it is about the peer, it's about the peer relationships around the table. The collaborative funds are something different. They're a mix of individuals and institutions. But the Democracy Funding Circle is just individuals who share a similar experience in that they inherited wealth or they made wealth and they like working together. And they like learning about, they like deepening their skills in grant making in this format. So, the circle now has put, has probably granted more than a million and a half dollars over 10 years. And it really led the way through the Democracy Funding Circle that we began to fund the first organizations that were not women's organizations. But they were crucial

organizations in building democracy and they had or through the Ms. Money we forced them to develop a gender analysis. So examples would be multi-issue state level coalitions, like PLAN in Nevada which is the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada. It's a great example of a multi-issue state level coalition that isn't just women but it has women's organizations in the coalition and it has a gender analysis about how building women's power is going to move progressive policy forward. And then also we funded some women's organizations like Idaho Women's Network, Montana Women's Vote. We got involved in public education – we funded over the years a couple of organizations that were fighting for public education. We got involved some in censorship issues, in immigration issues. So it was—the circle was a wonderful thing for the Ms. Foundation because it allowed us to learn about much more on our landscape but again because we had no general grants program. We wouldn't have been funding in any of those issue areas if we did not have the Democracy Funding Circle. And so it's been really important to us in that way.

AP Out on the landscape right now, the Global Fund for Women which funds globally, in the global south I think mostly. And the Women's Funding Network, which is the organization mothering, if you will, the hundred women's funds around the country and some around the world. And we have the Ms. Foundation. What opportunities do you see - elaborate on kinds of relationships the Ms. Foundation has with those other or national or international infrastructure organizations.

SG Right. Well, to answer the second part first, so the Ms. Foundation was the first women's fund in 1972, although some people—and I think it—you—it's true that business and professional women had a small foundation but you know it wasn't a social justice foundation. And, we were the model for other women's funds. And Women's Funding Network came on the

scene in '85 so and you know—and that's just about the same the time Marie comes here and Ms. begins to grow. So—and there were, of course, there were the what was called then The Women's Foundation, simply The Women's Foundation in San Francisco. It was local to San Francisco and now has become The Women's Foundation of California. That got started up. Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice got started up after us but not so far after. And I think they are now celebrating their 20th year. Maybe more than that. It is more than that because Katherine's been there for 20 years and she was on the board for years before that so maybe they're coming into their 30th year. But anyway, there were some other funds and that's why the Women's Funding Network got started. But Ms. has always been, if you will, the mother or the "mother fund." And then in '87 starts the Global Fund for Women. From a very different, from a very particular business model or motivation which—and set of values, the value being 'let's raise money into the Global Fund and grant it in the Global South. Raise it and grant it.' So that even today, 70 cents on the dollar that is brought into the Global Fund goes out in a grant and our percentage is half that because we're doing all this more than money stuff, etc. And the public education through "Take our Daughters to Work." So, but the Global Fund has grown tremendously over the last 10 years of Kavita's leadership. I mean it grew steadily but through Ann Firth Murray, the first president. But with Kavita taking over 10 years ago, it's grown. I mean I'm one of the biggest admirers of the Global Fund. And I watch very carefully what they do. So that in and I'm a good friend of Kavita's. Kavita—when I was telling what I was talking about the Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development and the MacArthur Foundation came in—Kavita was our program officer at MacArthur. So I've known Kavita for a long time and because of that when I became the president and we were, at that point, still involved in our endowment campaign and the Global Fund was beginning an endowment

campaign. They had never had a permanent endowment before because really it—it wasn't in their value system. You know, bring the money in and get it out, bring it in, get it out. Why do you need an endowment? So they had to do some values work to even gain a consensus among the board and among the family of the Global Fund that building an endowment was a good thing and but then they did get to that point and so they got the point of wanting to have a campaign. So Kavita and I and Nicki McIntyre who was then the VP for communications and development of the Global Fund who I'm also close friends with, we were talking. And I think it was me who said why don't we do joint house parties. Because it's no accident that our two institutions are in these endowment campaigns. And what we are trying to bring about in the world is so linked. And you know you can arguably say that one of the most important things that could happen for women in the global south is for women in the United States to wake up and start influencing their own government. And to the extent you lose ground in the United States, you are going to lose ground around the world. So they said yes, good idea. So we did two joint house parties. We did a house party in New York City and a house party in San Francisco. And I wasn't able to get to San Francisco because my father was dying at that time but both of the parties were very successful in the sense that they showed—they corroborated our hunch that it would inspire donors to see these two institutions working together. And, to see that we weren't, you know, fighting for donors. And another reason we could do it is because we already knew it was the case, that some of our largest donors gave to both of us. Of course they did. You know for the very reasons we knew—we were connected. The donors knew it. And the donors knew that if they cared about women in the global south they gave to the Global Fund. If they cared about women in the US they gave to Ms. and if they cared about women in their locality they gave to their local women's fund. And they did care about all those things so

they did give to all of them. So there were lots of models for that. So we didn't get to the point of making joint asks and I would have liked to get to that point, but we didn't. And then the Women's Funding Network meanwhile went through a renaissance a few years ago when Chris Grumm came in as the president—another very big vision person. And she has now grown The Women's Funding Network. It has created some tensions. Inside the women's philanthropy infrastructure are turf issues, if you will. There are definitely turf issues. And there may be in the future mission issues. Because as the Women's Funding Network of which I am on the board and now Kavita is also on the board, the WFN is about to launch into a strategic planning process because they have just completed a 10 year strategic plan. So I think some very fundamental and good questions will be on the table in the next year about what really is the mission of WFN. Is it wholly a network? Is it wholly a membership organization? How much power do the members have? Or is it something more than a membership organization? Does it have some other part of its mission? And there have also been international kind of rubs because before WFN again grew up and there had grown up housed at the Global Fund the International Network of Women's Funds. And strong relationships had formed. And the Global Fund actually had a part of its—the Global Fund made grants to other women's funds giving in the global south and not giving in but located in the global south that were growing up and it raised money to do that. So then here along comes WFN growing up and saying no we're the Global Network. Well the way it's been resolved—and it hasn't fully been resolved yet,—but is the International Network of Women's Funds said, 'Well, we're, you know, going to have to belong to both. We're not going to disband basically because we, because what we already formed feels more indigenous to us. You know it feels, this is our network and it's a trust issue among other things. There are trust issues and no we're not, we're just not at a point where we're going to

disband this network and say your WFN is it. We will join WFN and we will talk to you.’ And now there is actually a Memorandum of Agreement between the two networks which took a lot of hashing out and there are still, you know, some – it’s an emotional issue for people. So definitely WFN growing and having such a visionary leader that really and really getting out there, it has caused some issues. And from my perspective, that’s life and we’re—there are important questions that get brought out to the table and we have to answer those questions over time. We have to do it, I think, in a way that is respectful, and in a way that good dialogue and conversation can happen. And you know my personal opinion is that hasn’t always been the case. Uh, so we have work to do. We the collective, we have work to do to come to a table and really talk and be able to. But there should be enough trust that people can really lay their cards on the table. And I don’t think that’s the situation we have right now. I hope we will.

AP So as you look at the missions of the individual organizations, that’s one side of the story. But one of the key words in the philanthropy world these days is sustainability and so do you think from your heart of hearts that there are funds available to sustain each of these organizations and not only sustain them but to help them thrive after that so they can meet their missions?

SG Yeah, I do. I absolutely do. I know that’s true. So I think it is about the definition of what the mission is. And then what’s appropriate, if you will, and that’s kind of a funny word but my belief is that the actual grant making institutions, you know the kind of sustainability and the kind of growth you’re talking about, would be different for the grant making institutions like the Ms. Foundation and the Global Fund than it would for the Women’s Funding Network. Um, that the building of an endowment for instance—you know the Ms. Foundation endowment already sits at \$28 million and it needs to grow to \$100, \$200, \$300 million dollars. WFN

should never have—you know if it had an endowment it should be more like a reserve fund. That's my opinion. The Global Fund should have an endowment and it should grow as high as it can possibly grow. And, but I'm not sure everybody agrees with that. So, but I do think there's enough money. You know, I was just at the Gates Foundation and went to meet with Hillary Pennington, the new person in the US program who's under this heading of special initiatives. And it just happened that Kavita was in Seattle at exactly the same time I was so we got together and she has, Global Fund has received money from Gates but not really through a program area. It's received it more through kind of a donor or donor designated thing. And you know what Gates should do? Is there money? You bet there's money. Gates could give the Global Fund a \$200 million endowment. In a heartbeat. It could give the Ms. Foundation a \$200 million endowment in a heartbeat. In a day.

AP That's very ...

SG In 19—in 2000—Marie and I—and I could show you the proposal. Marie and I went to the Ford Foundation in the year 2000. Again, this was before the bust. It was during the boom when money was coming out of philanthropy like crazy. We went to Ford with a \$30 million dollar endowment request. We ended up getting \$5 million dollars. So, is the money there? Yes the money is there. Is the will, is the will there? That's the question.

AP That then raises a very interesting conversation about the growth of the women's funds and whether you see them as a parallel construct to mainstream philanthropy. And whether some of the issues that this raises would ever be resolved. And what kind of a future we might see.

SG Yeah, huge question...I am afraid that they have become a parallel universe and I don't think that's a good thing. Especially as, you know, the prevailing belief seems that women are equal. We did that, you know, we struggled with that kind of inequality in our society but we got

there and there are bigger problems now. And then not see any relationship between these bigger problems and the fact that A) women could play a much larger role in solving them, let alone the fact that women are not equal and this isn't enough. But that is the prevailing view. And, so therefore this women's funding infrastructure which has grown up I think is seen by many in mainstream philanthropy as a parallel universe. And that's not good. So I am also on the board of Women & Philanthropy – the affinity group. And a little history there is that Women & Philanthropy, in the last 3 or 4 years of its existence has not been able to support itself financially. It's been in financial difficulty. So to telescope a fairly long process that the board went through, we made a decision over the last year. We used a great—I think—a great process to come to this decision, to become a project of another organization. And we looked at two organizations, one being the Council on Foundations and the other being the Women's Funding Network. And we held like five hour meetings with each of these organizations that we, you know, came from a large listing, got down to them. And based on those meetings and based on our objectives to keep the mission of Women & Philanthropy alive as a real mission, we decided to become a project of the Council on Foundations. And that agreement has been signed. And now we are just two weeks away from the Council meeting. It's becoming public, etc. Some people would say this is sleeping with the enemy but our feeling was that we wanted to get closer to mainstream philanthropy. That Women & Philanthropy as the affinity group—if it joined up with WFN, it would just reinforce this parallel thing and you know we would be like seceding from mainstream philanthropy in going over to the women's spot, where the mission of Women & Philanthropy has always been about influencing mainstream philanthropy. So we have joined up and I think if anything has potential, this has potential. And now we have to see what we can make of it because now Women & Philanthropy Project will have a committee, a bonafide

committee of the Council on Foundations. It will have board members of the Council on this committee as well as others. We are attracting a CEO, not exclusively, but a lot of CEOs to that committee. They're not your most prominent CEOs of philanthropy but they're prominent enough. And you know this again had been a problem with the affinity group standing on its own. It could not attract the CEO level any longer, except for women's funds. But it couldn't attract the CEO level in mainstream philanthropy. It could attract the program officer level but not the CEO level. So I think this is a really good move and now we have to mobilize now that we are in the belly of the beast so to speak. We have to make the most of it. We're close to the membership. We have access to the membership and we can talk with and to the membership and we'll have some of the membership now talking to the membership. So I feel very excited about that. But it, it is you know, in this I wasn't at the last board meeting of the Women's Funding Network, but apparently as we start this strategic planning process, there will be lots more conversation about this question. Has it become a parallel universe—is that a good thing? A bad thing? If we're concerned about let's say ending poverty, uh is you know, the mantra of the Women's Funding Network has been 'women's funds are the investment of choice', right? Well, you know that's debatable. So, and we have to scale up and again it brings up certain questions about the scale that women's funds have to reach. And your typical local women's fund is probably never going to reach that scale so you've got definitely to have different things going on within this universe. You've got a strong statewide women's fund in California that should definitely keep growing and scaling up. You've the Global Fund which should keep scaling up. The Ms. Foundation and Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice that should keep scaling up but you know - can it? Will it? The Third Wave Foundation – I honestly have two minds about whether that should keep scaling up. I'm, you know, sometimes I think maybe we

should all just join into one big foundation, you know the one big Global Fund for Women and really be global including the US and really be able to amass our forces. Because we are, you know, just like in mainstream philanthropy, you're out of the era where it's about deep knowledge and fields. We are out of the era where it's about 'it's fun to have a women's fund.' The point is—how are we going to get some of these problems solved? And how are we really going to move women forward? And you know when you walk into Gates and you realize that that Foundation alone is 10% of all US philanthropy. Until I walked in there, that number had really not hit me in the face. And it's controlled by three people. You know, Bill, Melinda and Warren. I mean that fact really had not like tugged my heart strings, but it tugged them when I was there. And not in a good way. So I think that there are a lot of fairly large questions out there.

AP Where do you think that the advocacy in public policy work related to the issues that we've been discussing, where are they housed?

SG Well I think they're—they're housed in, they're housed in, you know... I think the best women's funds sometimes—I think the only women's funds worth having—are those that are taking on the advocacy and policy questions and that are working with, you know, with mainstream philanthropy. And I think the best women's funds are working with mainstream philanthropy but—and that was the beauty of the collaborative fund model. You know what this conversation is helping me to think about again is—we still have to have those kinds of partnerships. What do they look like now? And so, because again, you know, Ms. is going to, its course has always been that of an activist organization. But we're going to reaffirm that now. I'm going to reaffirm that as my presidency goes forward. We are an activist organization and we are a foundation. But we can't be just a foundation. So we couldn't go to the—it's not that

the Global Fund is just a foundation, of course they are an activist fund. But they haven't yet developed their voice as an influencer as much as I think they will in the next 10 years. I think that's where they're going and if Kavita stays another 10 years. If she does, that's where they're going. You know she's not going to worry about what grants they're making anymore, she's going to worry about what, where they are heard. Where in the bigger venues and the mainstream venues they get heard. I think that's also the trajectory for the Ms. Foundation.

AP You have a history already though of providing technical assistance and resources for your grantees in that category that we would call "more than money." Lots of local women's funds do reach plateaus because of the limitations of the human and the financial resources. In addition to thinking about "more than money" bringing more people to the table, opening up your conference room, to non-profits around and opening doors for the grantees, what suggestions would you have for encouraging this upward trajectory?

SG I think my main suggestion would be about revisiting the mission of the organization and revisiting the values and see whether there are any changes, you know, that an organization or fund would want to make at those—at that foundational level. Because you either have to decide that this is a part of your mission, you know, to move upward in the way we're talking about or it's not. You know, there is sort of no value judgment involved. You just have to decide it. And then if you do decide it, you have to make sure that your, that those pieces – the mission and the beliefs and values express it, so that there can be no question in anyone's mind externally what you're about. And then, I think probably an organization may experience some fall-off from, you know, some people may not be on board with that who have been on board before. Hopefully that wouldn't be too large a group. And then it's about enlisting and recruiting and enlisting others. And then after that stuff—and that's crucial to what I'm about to say—I think

you have to find your voice. You know it's just, it's like when you move from adolescence to adulthood as a person and you begin to find your voice. At whatever stage of your life that happens for you, I think it's the same with organizations. And then in some cases you know an organization finds its voice and then loses it for a while and it has to find it again. Or it doesn't become as clear. You know it isn't as clear for a while and it has to, and I think in some ways that is where Ms. is. The voice was very clear during the 90's and into the 21st century but we experienced some mission drift as our former president pursued the White House Project and then, and then we have gone through this transition time from a 20 year president to me. And so, and some, you know like the Katrina work has been a point of clarity in that transition time where we were just called to action and you know in a day, on a weekend, talking to nobody I decided we're going to have a Katrina Women's Response Fund. I came in and said that to the staff and they're like – huh? And I went—nope, we're doing that. I already did it and I got 29 emails out there so you can't stop me. And, \$2-\$3 million dollars later we're glad we did that. So it is about feeling called to action. And that's where now, you know, within a few months you'll see Ms. out there again making a new declaration about who we are. And so I think an organization has to do that. I think you have to - you have to find your voice and then try to stay with it. And bring those people around you who can, you know, reinforce that—that are going to be a good support to you.

AP Just like the life of a non-profit is evolving and sometimes uh it's revolutionary rather than evolutionary. The philanthropic landscape changes too. So from the perspective of where you sit today, how do you see the philanthropic landscape changing? You talked about your visit to Gates and that was revelatory I think.

SG Uh huh.

AP But what else do you see, particularly from your vantage point of being a women's organization.

SG Well, I do see what I talked about before. "We did women" and that era of being able to walk in a room and be representing women and not be seen as a special interest group. That era seems to have ended. It's all very disturbing to me now because whenever someone mentions the word 'woman,' immediately you go into this box over here and single issue and special interest. So I think that's not a good development on the landscape...on it's... the landscape is going to continue to change dramatically. And I think when you have a foundation like Gates overshadowing the Ford Foundation, you know that things have changed. And it will be real interesting to see who Ford chooses as its next president. It will be very interesting to see and it'll be extremely influential. It will tell you a lot about that institution. And unfortunately because that institution still is such a force, it will matter on the landscape one way or another. So individuals hold much more sway. I think individual philanthropists, you know some of the 'structures' quote unquote that have been built – women's funds among them—don't feel like the right structure to a growing number of donors. And so that, I think that's a big factor. I don't know how that's going to play out. And I think that—I, you know—and I think that the Council on Foundations for instance, you know, which has new leadership in Gunderson and now Women & Philanthropy is there, I still think that, you know, we'll see. I think the, I think it's not in yet. You know what I've heard is that the Council—he wants to change the name to the Council on Philanthropy from the Council on Foundations. That could be a good move. And yet I don't know whether you—whether in doing that and given the vision he has—whether he could really build the Council, you know, whether again you could use that as a leverage point to try to influence the landscape of philanthropy. I would hope you can but I don't know. I don't know if

we're beyond that already because of all these other changes on the landscape. And just so many more people with individual wealth that they don't have to play and these older structures, you know, the Council on Foundations being another one of those structures whether you call it the Council on Foundations or the Council on Philanthropy. It could already have passed its time. And I think that its board in choosing Gunderson has chosen someone who doesn't think so and the board doesn't think so. They've chosen leadership who's going to try to not make that's true, but I think the jury is out on that.

So you know—and then there's still the disturbing—there's still the fact that most of what passes for philanthropy in our country, it's really not about changing the world. It's not about making the world a better place. It's not about social justice. So that, that still is disturbing to me on the landscape and in that context I think it's so interesting what's going to—it's so crucial what is going to happen at Ford. Because if they choose a new leader at Ford who is—who breaks the mold of the Ford leadership of being so solidly, at least for the last 40 years, about social justice and about making a better world. I shudder to think, you know, then you get around women's philanthropy—Ford is the standard. Ford is the standard of mainstreaming women into other issue areas. Not a very high standard, unfortunately. And that's been under the leadership of Susan Beresford and Frank Thomas before her. So you know you do sort of shudder to think what will happen when that leadership changes.

AP We have about 10 minutes left and I would like to spend that last 10 minutes talking about leadership a little bit. Some of the challenges that you face—and as a leader—you have a relatively young staff here at the Ms. Foundation, so who do you influence? Let's start with those two.

SG Okay, so you know what it's like for me as a leader of the Foundation, it's, this is a privileged seat to sit in and it is; it can be an influential seat. There's no question about that. Because of the history of the Fund, you know how the Foundation came to be, the Foundation has always had influence beyond itsand I think that can only grow as the endowment. And it's connected entirely, you know—you've got to grow your assets, man, if you want to get a place at the table. So that's what we're going to try to do. So there's no question that the Foundation is a leadership organization and that the person who sits as the president has an opportunity to influence and that again is about finding your voice and being capable and willing to express your voice. The Foundation staff—and we do have a lot of young women at the Foundation. They are very capable and very talented. Man,—I understand what it means when young women say we're not getting ready to lead, we're leading. That is true and it's also true—and by the way I'm like, my staff will tell you, I'm the quintessential person to say you have to hold both of these things at the same time; you can't choose one or the other. So it's true that they are already leading and it is also true that they are not ready to lead an institution like the Ms. Foundation. They don't have a clue as big as—I'm not talking about the nuts and bolts of making the decisions everyday about how payroll, how you actually are in a situation where you can make payroll every two weeks and how you do decide how to choose board members and you do do all these things. They don't have a clue. They need to. They need to grow into that. That's not a disparaging remark. It's just a remark that means there's a whole lot to leadership that they don't even see yet. And that I think there's a kind of generational leadership gap. There are the women from our generation who I know—and I am now almost 56 years old—who... we grew up more slowly kind of paying our dues and moving into leadership positions. You know, kind of more slowly, I think. So the generation under us or couple, that generation

maybe the next one, and a lot of them came into the non-profit sector. It appealed to us, you know, it was—it grew out of the civil rights movement and the women's movement and we knew we didn't want to work for corporations and came into the non-profit sector. Even though I come out of this corporate family, it never occurred to me that I would work for a business. So, but the generations beyond-- the age group beyond I think there was a lot more competition for those people and then corporations began to look better to them because the situation got better for women, because there was more emphasis in our society now on making money, on individual gain and all those kinds of things. And so I think we lost to some degree a whole generation of women who did not come into non-profits. They went the other way. And now you've got another generation that is here—women in their 20's now and in their early 30's. And I think we have to really be developing that leadership. It's, I mean the young women who come into here at age 24, whew, they knock my socks off. I mean I could not ever have done what they're doing at age 24. Nobody was giving me that responsibility and I wouldn't have known what to do with it if they had. So they have much more, you know, they have a feel for it and it's because of the success of the women's movement. They're more empowered at age 24. Thank God we did that. But they still need a lot of seasoning. And they still need a lot of development to move into a position like this. And if the Ms. Foundation, you know, aspires to be within let's say five years—have \$35 or \$40 million dollar endowment and be making \$10 million dollars of grants. And be even more sophisticated around voice, we have to be training. You know I even feel I don't have everything I need. I'm in a leadership program right now and so on any given day I wouldn't necessarily say I'm ready to lead, whereas a 26 year old employee at the Ms. Foundation would say 'I'm ready to lead right now.' It's like, 'Sweetheart, you're not quite there yet.' So that's what I think about that.

AP As a leader you interact with people all over the world in a lot of different contexts. Do you typically go out and try to —influence not politically or an advocacy point of view—but to influence women to take leadership roles?

SG Yes, definitely.

AP How does that materialize?

SG You know, it's mostly in kind of, you know, relationships. It might be because I am the president of the Ms. Foundation that subject always comes up. For our president at Ford, it wouldn't but, um, it does. I'm always encouraging. But it does. And so I'm always encouraging and I network, relentlessly as much as I can. And connect people together. And we just yesterday had a woman, a young woman—turned out a young woman from a very large foundation in Italy. I don't remember the name of it – Christopher Harris got her down here. And I did this both because I love to do those kinds of things, as you know, but also because Christopher had seen the Bologna young people when they were here at a moment's notice because I asked him to, so I owed him. And so I spent about 70 minutes with this young woman from a very large foundation in Italy and she spent some other time with one of our program people. But, so I didn't only answer her questions about the Foundation, but I inquired about from her, you know, did she think she would stay with this foundation? What did she see herself doing, etc? And I think that's important when you want to be building leadership is to always be inquiring. And then I think I'm—it's to be accessible. I think I probably err on the side of being too accessible. And that's becoming a larger problem – just ask Caroline about that. But you know Caroline, even this week I could show an e-mail that she sent me saying, 'You know, Sara, I think you have to stop saying that you can do all these things with all of us. Really, you're out

of time.’ And so, you know, that’s real. At the same time you know that’s just part of my personality.

AP I would never want to deny you the opportunity to influence people coming into this field because you’re very good at it. One way to grow the field though is to be more honest about the kind of role modeling and leadership. And you’re only one person, much as other people would like you to clone yourself in many different ways. You are one person. You have leadership of your staff. You know and then we have the Women’s Funding Network, we have the Global Fund, we have these local women’s funds. Is it time to think about a more organized, structured way to do leadership?

SG Yes, I think it absolutely is. We’ve actually begun a little research into that. And I said that I was in a leadership program. The program I am in is called the Rockwood Institute which is out in California and for the last maybe four or five years has been training non-profit progressive leaders. And it is leadership training. It’s not management training. And they have, they just did a three and half day training that they do called the Art of Leadership. And I’m hoping to get into the year long program they have which is called Leading from the Inside Out. And I was very, very impressed with the training. I went to the Art of Leadership—very helpful to me. Very sophisticated and it really was about leadership. So yes, I think it’s past time to do it. We have to figure out how.

AP What would you see in addition to the leadership, in addition to building sustainability, in addition to building the infrastructure better with endowments? What would you see are some of the challenges and opportunities for this women’s funding landscape in the next five to ten years?

SG I think the big challenge is to get to scale. Again to get some institutions to scale. I actually—I don't think all of them will get to scale. And scale means different things in different milieus if you would.

So that's a big challenge. I think a challenge is to—I'll give you a concrete example of this in on the Gulf coast with Katrina. WFN, the first grant that we received, well, when Katrina struck. The Ms. Foundation which has the relationship with the Kellogg Foundation, went to Kellogg immediately. Because we knew that they were very involved in the mid-south. WFN, which had a relationship with Kellogg, also went to Kellogg right away. We didn't talk to each other. I didn't call WFN but, more meaningfully to me, WFN didn't call me even though I am a member of WFN. And if you went up to WFN's website at that time in those days just after Katrina, you saw five women's funds. You saw them highlighting women's funds who were responding to Katrina—five local funds—none of them in the Gulf coast. But so they were responding because huge numbers of evacuees were coming into their communities. So—Atlanta, Chicago, Jackson, Memphis, and Birmingham. But we never got a call, even though we were responding immediately on the Gulf coast. So anyway, we both go to Kellogg—that's another story, but you can hear the way I'm saying that—that it was very disturbing to me. So when we were at Kellogg, it was really Kellogg who said... 'hmmm you're both here.' And so we were able to get a \$1.3 million dollar grant from Kellogg. It came to the Ms. Foundation and then we regranted about \$600,000 to WFN, which regranted in hundred thousand dollar chunks to those five funds—to their members who were in the other cities. So then there was money for an evaluation. So we worked on the evaluation with an outside evaluator and that went well. There was a report written and came out on the anniversary of the first anniversary of the levies breaking. So my point is that in that, if you looked at that publication that comes out, WFN

wanted the publication to be around women's funds. What is the benefit of women's funds in a situation like this? We wanted that publication to speak much more about the issues that our funding was trying to impact. And if we came up at loggerheads, so that's an example of something we've got to. It's an example of a challenge where, because I think we have to be thinking about the issues. And I understand about WFN, but it's a challenge to figure that out because the message—just a pure women's funds message—it's not, I don't think it's strong enough and I don't think it resonates because it's got to be linked to a very strong message about change; about policy change. About, you know, the Ms. Foundation should in some ways, I don't know, I think—but there was that moment when we were working on that publication that it was clear to me that we were not getting at all what we wanted out of that publication because we would have just done it differently. Left to our own devices, we would have done it very differently. So that I think that is a challenge. I think that the world is moving very fast now. And acting powerfully enough is a challenge. And that's why I'm in this leadership development program. It's why I think we have to act as powerfully as we possibly can right now. That's why I'm watching people who are acting more powerfully and—but not only with the message—which is again why it's somewhat troubling to me about WFN's message. But to the extent that it's only about the role women's funds can play in the world. I think it's too narrow and again these issues will be looked at in the strategic thinking that WFN is going to do.

AP For instance, that we have a lot more opportunity in front of us, so that's security there.

SG That's true.

AP The better news is that rarely have I encountered an individual who can blend her personal values, her philanthropic values with her work and you do it admirably.

SG Thank you.

AP Thank you so much for sharing your time.

INDEX

Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, 22, 28

Beresford, Susan, 33

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 26, 29

Carbine, Pat, 9

Center for Disease Control (CDC), 16

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, 13

Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development, 13, 15, 22

Collaborative Fund for Youth Led Social Change, 15, 19

Council on Foundations, 27, 28, 32, 33

Creason, William, 3

David & Lucile Packard Foundation, 15

Democracy Funding Circle, 18, 19, 20, 21

Ford Foundation, 13, 26, 32, 33, 36

Global Fund for Women, 21- 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30

Grand Haven Musical Fountain, 3

Grumm, Chris, 24

Gunderson, Steve, 32, 33

Hardisty, Jean, 19

Healthy Girls/ Healthy Women Collaborative Fund, 15

Idaho Women's Network, 21

Institute for Women's Economic Development, 12

International Network of Women's Funds, 24

Jewish Funds for Justice, 17

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, 13, 22

John Jay Whitney Foundation, 10

Johnson, Dorothy A., 7

Katrina Women's Response Fund, 31

Levi Strauss Foundation, 13

McIntyre, Nicki, 23

McKay, Robert (McKay Foundation), 20

Meyer, Paulette, 12, 13

Montana Women's Vote, 21

Ms. Foundation for Women, 2, 5, 8-16, 18-23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34-39

Murray, Ann Firth, 22

National Black Women's Health Project, 10

Pennington, Hilary, 26

Pew Charitable Trusts, 13

Pogrebin, Letty Cottin, 9

Political Research Associates, 19

Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN), 21

Ramdas, Kavita N., 22, 23, 24, 26, 30

Rockefeller Foundation, 13

Rockwood Institute, 37

Safety Circle, 18, 19

Schramm, Richard, 12

Scott, Julia, 10

Shea, Lindsay, 20

Steinem, Gloria, 9

Stern, Andrea, 20

Third Wave Foundation, 28

Thomas, Frank, 33

Thomas, Marlo, 9

Tufts University, 12

W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 38

Wilson, Marie, 10, 12, 26

Women & Philanthropy, 27, 32

Women's Action Alliance, 8

Women's Foundation of California, 22

Women's Funding Network, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 38, 39