

## Philanthropy

Published 7/4/23

41:33

### ***Opening music***

Theory. Practice. Discourse. Research. Insights. Dialogue.

### ***WGVU's Jennifer Moss:***

You're listening to Tilting the Earth's Praxis, a weekly discussion of important issues that impact civil society. With host Salvatore Alaimo.

### ***Salvatore Alaimo***

Welcome to this week's episode of Tilting the Earth's Praxis. Our subject is philanthropy, and I'm going to introduce our guests now. We have Aaron Dorfman, President and CEO of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy in Washington, D.C. Welcome, Aaron.

### ***Aaron Dorfman***

Thanks, Sal. Great to be with you.

### ***Salvatore Alaimo***

Great to have you. And we have two Grand Valley State University alumni working in the field of philanthropy. We have Madeleine Williams, Philanthropic Associate at Strategic Philanthropy Limited in Chicago. And Madeleine got her masters in philanthropy and nonprofit leadership at GVSU. Welcome, Madeleine.

### ***Madeleine Williams***

Hi there. It's great to be here.

### ***Salvatore Alaimo***

And we have Yah-Hannah Jenkins. She's a senior program manager at Miller Knoll Foundation, and she got her MPA at GVSU. Welcome, Yah-Hannah.

### ***Yah-Hannah Jenkins***

Glad to be here

### ***Salvatore Alaimo***

Glad to have all of you here. It's going to be a great discussion. So, I thought we just set the context for what we're going to talk about today by reading this ideal of civil society that is pretty much the basis for all of our episodes of this podcast. So, it's an ideal that we strive for, and it goes like this, "The organized systems of collective human experience, including economic exchange, political governance and social relationships that enable people to prosper, reach their potential as productive citizens and flourish as

human beings.” So, based on that, Aaron, what can philanthropy do to play an important role in that ideal?

**Aaron Dorfman**

Yeah, really great question Sal. You know, philanthropy plays an incredibly important role in our society. And yet philanthropic dollars, even though they've been growing like gangbusters over the past couple of decades, are tiny in comparison to government spending. So, I think one of the key questions is how do we pursue the common good in our society? And we do that through government spending. We do that through private sector enterprise, and we do that through philanthropy. But philanthropy is very much in a complementary role to government. It can never be a substitute for government playing its proper role in ensuring a fair, just and equitable society where everyone thrives. Just an example. If you just take one issue, education, the most popular philanthropic cause except for religion. Government spending on education dwarfs philanthropic spending by a factor of about 3000 to 1. So, uh, one of the important roles for philanthropy to play in that issue and in any issue is to influence public policy and to ensure that government is accountable and responsive to society, and especially to those with the least power, wealth and opportunity or anyone who's been oppressed or marginalized historically in our society. And I think that is one of the highest leverage ways that philanthropy can build towards this ideal society by investing in community organizing, civic engagement, advocacy to ensure that our government spending is doing the most it can to advance the common good.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

So just a follow up. Is it troublesome or problematic if people actually believe that philanthropy can serve as a substitute for government?

**Aaron Dorfman**

I think it's incredibly problematic. It leads to a preference for public policies that that preference charitable giving as a way to achieve the common good over government spending. And I think the right policies actually will look at how do we ensure that government has enough revenue to play its proper role in society while we also encourage charitable giving as a complement to that. Look, I'm the first one to admit that government doesn't always get it right, and it's super important to have thousands of philanthropists, millions of philanthropists also pursuing their vision for the common good, you know, in ways that may be different from government spending. But, we can't, we can't preference charitable giving over government spending as a way to achieve a common good. There's just not enough money there. It'll never happen. And it's really not a very democratic way to structure a society.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

I appreciate those comments. So, building off of that, Madeleine we'll shift to you now. So, you advise the very philanthropist that Aaron just referenced. What is your work look like? How do you advise them? Obviously, they have their own preferences. How do we balance their preferences with what are the greatest needs in society, which we know is based on perception and is subjective?

**Salvatore Alaimo**

Yeah, that's a good question, so I am a philanthropic associate for Strategic Philanthropy located in Chicago, Illinois, and we're a boutique philanthropy advising firm, and we work with ultra-high net worth clients, families, individuals, and they're closely held are family businesses who have a high concentration of wealth and in really in an encouraging way, want to do something good with it. So, when people come to us, typically they're their wealth advisors or estate attorneys. They're at a place where they have money and they want to direct it strategically to things that they care about, which is a really good thing. And so, my day today could consist of legacy gift planning, working as the back end staff member for a family foundation, researching and strategizing, grant programs for foundations, developing next generation, giving strategies for these foundations. And we're constantly in attention right, of what the donor wants and what the donor intends and what is the need and the best practice in that particular issue area that given time. So, as advisors, we see our role is really critical for individuals who have large amounts of philanthropic dollars to disburse. And we really do try and balance and be good listeners, be empathetic and be understanding of what family values are involved in their giving entity, what inspires the desires of their foundation to give, to give their money, but also to then take our knowledge of field research. Listening to experts who are on the ground actually doing the work within nonprofits and then kind of connecting the two things together. So, we see ourselves as constant learners and expert generalists. In a way, I'm constantly diving into new issue areas on behalf of my clients that I may never have interacted with before and really trying to soak up like a sponge what's happening on the ground in those areas so that I can best marry those practices with what my client is hoping and wanting to do.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

And Yah-Hannah, a similar situation. You were at a community foundation and now you're at a corporate foundation. Foundations have their own ideas, right and their own focus areas, and there are many ingredients that go into their ultimately their decisions on who they're going to fund, at what level and why. So, can you give us a background on your work and what goes into those decisions and how they balance these, these tensions that Aaron and Madeline are describing?

**Yah-Hannah Jenkins**

Yeah. Yeah, for sure. So right now, I, you know, six weeks into a role at Miller Knoll Foundation and prior to that, spending some time at Community Foundation, Holland Zealand. And, you know, one of the big things that we did coming out of the pandemic where we had the opportunity to pursue funding through issue-based grant making was, Hey, this presents a really great opportunity to pause and just steep ourselves again in community conversations. What are the data to community health needs assessment, youth, youth assessment surveys and then talking to the experts. As Maddy said, you know, we really prided ourselves and continue to pride ourselves on building relationships with the leaders of nonprofit organizations within the community. And we had the benefit of that because you so that's a geographic grant maker. You can step yourselves around the community conversations and continuing to build those

relationships of trust that results in, you know, partners being feeling free to come up to you or to reach out when there's a new idea, a new philosophy, a new discovery, and then also being able to connect with the program directors and building those relationships with the individuals who are delivering those services to community partners. I think one of the, the big things as well is thinking about who is within that tent or, you know, historically in particular community foundation tended to have had or built relationships of trust or had thought of community as a very specific part of the community and really trying to continue to expand that umbrella to be an inclusive, have an inclusive perspective around who is a part of that tent, who informs where and how the community moves forward, and how those resources are directed within a corporate space. The philosophy tends to be directed by our associates. So that is a big part of the, the philosophy within Miller Knoll being, being directed by. We are the individuals who work for the organization, live what their passions are, what their interests are, but placing a stake in the ground. And so, for that stake in the ground, that umbrella, those three specific buckets that, you know, the organization is leading into advancing equity within the communities where our associates live, thinking about diversifying the design pipeline and thinking about our planet. And those were strategic priorities that fed out of that corporate strategy. So, there is a little bit of that top down, but really still informed by and then that deliver and the delivery of that is informed then by I associate. So, so my role in both spaces has just been a lot of listening and a lot of relationship building, a lot of building out community and trust and just continuing to keep a pulse on what's happening. It's harder to do that when you have 40 communities as opposed to a couple here in a local community foundation, but really being driven by what people are seeing and seeing as the main needs within their communities, it's that that the ultimate goal.

### **Salvatore Alaimo**

So that contextual grounding is helpful. So, I'm going to swing it back to you Aaron. Let's focus on the R in NCRP's name. So, responsive philanthropy, what is it? How do we know when we see it and how do we know when it's not there?

### **Aaron Dorfman**

Yeah. You know, a lot of people, the definition of responsive has evolved over the years, and NCRP was founded in 1976. The meaning of the word that, that we like to focus on is that we want full and to be to be responsive to communities with the least wealth, power and opportunity in our society. So, it's not the more common definition of responsive that you might think of today, where you would categorize someone's giving as either strategic or responsive. We're talking about in the broader sense, is it responsive to what society needs? And, you know, one of the things that we've been focused on for the last several years is a framework that we think helps donors and foundations do the most good in the world. And it's found in our Power Moves toolkit. And we think donors and foundations ought to be building power sharing power and wielding power in pursuit of equity and justice. And the, the building power piece is primarily about the grantmaking that some of what I was talking about before. Are they funding the kinds of nonprofits that are building power for marginalized communities to help them have a voice in our democracy? Sharing power is super important. And Maddy, I'd be curious later if some of the ultra-high net worth families that you work with

are adopting some of these practices. But sharing power can be as simple as co-creating your strategy with the communities most affected rather than, you know, just the people at the foundation or the donors and their family. Set in the strategy and then looking for grantees to implement it. Providing unrestricted, multi-year general operating support is another way to share power with grantees and some forward thinking. Family foundations are sharing power at the governance level and adding community members and non-family trustees to the board, to the board of the philanthropy so that they're really sharing power in that in that ultimate expression. And then wielding power is super important as well. Donors and foundations have tremendous power in our society. And are they going to let that power sit on the sidelines or are they going to wield it in pursuit of their societal goals? So that can be their reputation in all capital. That's huge for especially for community foundations and corporate foundations. If they take stands on behalf of communities that are being targeted or marginalized or oppressed in some way that can be very impactful. And wielding power can also apply to the investment corpus of an endowed philanthropy. Are you investing in the kinds of things that are consistent with your charitable goals, not just seeking a financial return? So those are some of the things that I think about that help make philanthropy really responsive to communities with the least power in our society.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

How much of a role is public awareness about the concept of philanthropy important? Just a few things. Aaron, I remember you telling me years ago that 31% of the philanthropic dollars from the top 100 foundations in America give money directly to help the poor. I think most citizens might be surprised by that. I think when I say the word foundation, people will either think it's the base of a building or the basis to put makeup on one's face, and they may not know what a philanthropic foundation is. So do we have some work to do to just make people aware of what this concept is and the fact that people work in this field and make decisions around it that impact people's lives?

**Aaron Dorfman**

You know, I think where that comes into play the most is when Congress starts thinking about whether they should regulate philanthropy differently, whether they should change the rules of the game. That's when whether or not there is public awareness of foundations and how philanthropy works, that's when that really matters. Barring that, it's really not super important that the general public understand how it works. At least that's my take on it.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

So, Yah-Hannah, does any of this resonate with you and your work with the foundation's understanding you're only six weeks into the new job. Probably still settling in.

**Yah-Hannah Jenkins**

Yeah.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

What can, what can you share with us about maybe some of the successes and challenges of your work in relation to how philanthropy works in this country?

***Yah-Hannah Jenkins***

Yeah. You know, in maybe using that to, to build on something that Aaron mentioned and the conversation, you know, I think. Another part of what I do is women of color give, and that is an attempt to democratize philanthropy and thinking about it, that participatory giving and the, the, the need to you know, do you folks need to know or be aware of or understand the role? And I think what we've encountered is that individuals are if they think about philanthropy, they think about it as totally disconnected from their day to day and not something that they can or have access to. And they think it's just, there is an opportunity to reframe and explore philanthropy from a broad perspective that includes a more democratic type of perspective on it, and that being a good neighbor, helping out with a bag of flour or whatnot, giving to your church, giving to a family member, that there is a a broad scope in which within which we can view philanthropy. And I think that that might be, you know, one of the, the other elements that I have encountered throughout my, my time in philanthropy, it's this there is an opportunity to engage more voices in it. Reframing as we move forward in discovering what we could be and reckoning with the history of philanthropy within this country and really thinking about it from an economic lens as well, where the reason why philanthropy exists. On the one hand, yes, it might be in response to a need that has arisen within civil society, but there is also this this wealth disparity and this extraction that has resulted in inequitable generation of wealth, that has then created a space for a whole sector and, and really being able to co-create our future with all members of society toward that. I think that's what a lot of community foundations, large foundations, corporate foundations are continuing to explore. How, what does the future of philanthropy look like? How do we engage more voices? How do we strike that balance of folks who do this day to day, who have a certain level of expertise to bring to the table, thinking about philanthropy, thinking about wealth advisors, and then also thinking about nonprofit leaders who have a specific level of expertise related to the, you know, the health disparities and all of these pieces, as well as the individuals within the community who are impacted by the decisions that everyone makes. How do we continue to big build bigger, broader tables to be okay with slowing down the process a little bit because it can get messy? And I know that that can sometimes, you know, I'll use quotation mark, "unprofessional." And again, this there just needs to be a redefinition of so many things to be open to the messiness of co-creating a future where everyone can thrive. So that's kind of my circular way of answering the question. I think everybody is wrestling right now with how to do that, how to do it well, how to ensure we're not exploiting people's time, extracting information, guidance, and then not circling back, not, not actually delivering anything that each organization does it in different ways. Task forces reimagining that within community foundations, We've got committees that make decisions and recommendations to boards. What do those look like? How do we engage more identity-based groups to be able to explore what decisions should be made to look like within with their centering that specific community's needs and identity and, and then corporate philanthropy, thinking about more participatory type of work as well as what does that look like from the associate or

employee standard as well as more community voice. So those tensions continue to be explored and everyone is approaching it from, from different spaces.

### ***Salvatore Alaimo***

So, the power dynamic that Aaron was describing and it's built into what you were just saying, Yah-Hannah, it seems inevitable. Those that hold the resources, those that need the resources and I don't mean to oversimplify it, but that power dynamic is sort of baked into this work. So Aaron was curious, Madeleine, about the shared power. Does that play into the relationships with your clients and how did the head of those relationships play out and how do you advise your clients around some of these issues?

### ***Madeleine Williams***

Yeah, that's a great question. We've been having a lot of really interesting conversations around this as we work with clients who have an interest in being a more equitable partner and, and learning what that means. And I think to take it one step back and connect a little bit to what Yah-Hannah was just saying is with family philanthropy in order to be. Good partners and share power. There is a need to open handedly. Be willing to share your values as social issues shift and change. When family start a foundation or come together, they often do so with a set of family values that are good and important. But as families change, new generations come to the table and the social issues they're working to address change. Family philanthropies need to then shift their values to be to be responsive. I think sometimes families can get caught in the middle there of really struggling to share power or shift because they're still working to think about, well, how do I answer this original set of values that our foundation or our fund was started under? And I think for families to get to a point where they're willing to think about what sharing power looks like or how to become a more equitable partner, they have to get to a place where they can look at their values and say our original values and commonalities still hold true. But here's what they look like today to be more responsive to where these issue areas are today. And so, yeah, and even in order to even get to that place of sharing, power to power, wielding power, building power. They have to do all the work that comes beforehand to think about how they honor, how they began, how that translates into where the world is today. Because, you know, family foundations or individuals are still trying to address a social issue as it was 20 years ago when they were started. They're probably not making much progress. So, in have to bring, bring things forward. But as you guys are both talking and Aaron, specifically, as you were talking about your definition of sharing power, I was thinking about conversations we've been having with clients about how we intake information about grants. And I think for us that's been a really important forum to think about the ways that we share power and become more equitable partners with grantees is what information we ask for, how we use it, what we what we ask them to report on, what we're doing, what we're going to do with that, or why it matters. And I think that has drastically changed as a result of some of the call to action that philanthropy has received to become more equitable and to let go of power and become true partners. And that that's an immediate example that comes to mind of how a lot of family foundations are reckoning with what this practically looks like. And often times that is a place applications and reporting and form that. Foundations and families. Right. Without

maybe even realizing it, are still exercising a lot of power and control because they aren't being responsive to the time the staff, you know the effort of all that goes into these aspects that are required to even get, get a check in the mail, let alone be partners in other ways along the way.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

So, Yah-Hannah, you mentioned needs assessments. You know, research studies. I know, Aaron, your organization, the National Committee, regularly conducts research. So, I'm going to go to you, Aaron, with this one. How important is research in the field of philanthropy? What can we say about that?

**Aaron Dorfman**

I think research is vital and critical to doing good philanthropy. Uh, you know otherwise, you're just sort of reacting to your gut feelings about what needs to happen in the world. You know, one of the clearest demonstrations of the importance of research to good decision making came early in my tenure at NCRP. And we were frustrated by how few foundations were investing in community organizing and advocacy and civic engagement work. And I went around the country and I talked to presidents and executive directors of foundations, and I said, Why? Why aren't you funding this? And almost to a person, the staff said to me, Well, Aaron, I get it. I know why funding those kinds of things has, has impact and has high leverage. But our trustees, they just want to help people. And I'm having trouble making the case to them for how funding these rabble rousers actually helps anyone. And I said, You know what? I have a pretty good research team. I think we can figure out a way to help demonstrate the tangible benefits for families and communities when foundations and ultrahigh net worth donors do invest in those kinds of high leverage strategies. And we put together a rigorous series of studies that we conducted over a three-year period in seven different parts of the country, in red states and blue states, in urban areas, in rural areas. We documented the impacts of 110 different nonprofits. And we were able to show \$26 billion in economic benefit to families and communities off of 320 some odd million dollars in funding from foundations and other sources for their advocacy efforts. So, if you do the math, that's a return on investment of 115 to 1. And over the next, over the past, you know, 14 years since we finished those studies, I can't tell you how many foundations have told me, "Oh, yeah, we used your studies to, like, expand or create a new portfolio funding those kinds of high leverage strategies." So, you know, people don't always act on good research, but sometimes they do, and it can be very powerful when it happens.

**Salvatore Alaimo**

Well, you should know the study you did in the Pacific Northwest region, which showed a tremendous return on investment. Advocacy is required reading for my graduate students. So there you go. So I'm. Yeah. Yeah. So I'm now going to segue into some questions that might get a little prickly. I guess I would call them tough love questions. And the reason why I asked these questions is because, as all three of you have pointed out, there's a lot at stake here in civil society in terms of what we rely on philanthropy to do, what we expect of it, its capabilities, its incapacities. So I'll just start in sort of like a round robin free form style here. I'll just throw them out and you guys can



just jump in. So the first one is, is it time that the 1969 Tax Reform Act that established the 5% annual giving of assets be changed? Do we go up to 5.5% or we go to six? That's been quite, quite a long time, but we're going to be closing in soon on 60 years. Is it time to change that law? Any of you?

***Yah-Hannah Jenkins***

I can jump in. And, you know, I think my understanding of the establishment of that law was that it was reflecting at that time, like the stock market return or whatever, like it was on average about 5%. And so that was the expected earnings on an endowment. And so, you know, making that the spendable minimum for organizations, I think exploring and revisiting, is that the reality and what that looks like in comparison to when you can do all the extrapolation as it pertains to cost of living and all of these different things or inflation and how that has been that has changed over the years. But I think always an opportunity to explore and, and see where we land as it pertains to something that can be standardized.

***Madeleine Williams***

I, I tend to feel that the more money we can get to the hands of those who are doing work on the ground, the sooner the better. I think, you know, actually, when you ask this question, the thought that popped into my head is also what about donor advised funds? And what do we do about that? And I think that's an equally relevant question.

***Aaron Dorfman***

Yeah, Sal, important question. I'm a, you know, political realist and this, you know, this Congress and the one before it and the one before that can't get anything done on far more pressing issues facing our society. So, you know, the thought that they would do anything at all, let alone anything good on reform, updating the 1969 Tax Reform Act. I have very little faith in that said, you know, there is value to society in perpetual foundations. I don't think that perpetuity should be done away with or outlawed. Also, we encourage foundations to voluntarily spend well, spend well above the 5%. You know, that's a that's a legislated floor, that's not a ceiling. And donors who are working to address thorny issues might find it smart to spend more now rather than holding on to that money in the future. And on the donor advised fund, a point that Maddy brought up, you know, in the President Biden's current budget, it does do away with the donor advised fund loophole where private foundations can count as part of their 5%, while the fund distributions gifts that they make to a donor advice fund, even if they never if those funds never leave the donor advised fund and the proposed budget would close that loophole. That's an unabashedly smart thing to do and should get incorporated this year.

***Salvatore Alaimo***

So, building off your comments and Madeleine's yours. Are we? Are we sacrificing today's fires and problems for tomorrow's? Are we holding back too much and not addressing the metaphoric and in some cases the literal fires that are burning all around us in this country.

***Madeleine Williams***

I think this question is a great opportunity to think about what it might look like, especially from my perspective, for family foundations to strike a balance there. Aaron, as you mentioned, there's value to society and perpetual foundations. I think it's important for organizations to know that they have partnerships that are committed to funding their work. What it looks like today and what it looks like tomorrow. But I think there's a piece there that organizations also need to know and have the kind of relationship and trust that they have true partners and funders that they can. And, and stand on that long term commitment. But also, when something comes up, they need specific support for a new fire that pops up tomorrow, weeks, months down the road that they can approach funders with these with these requests and with these immediate needs. And I'm not sure that it feels like a bold band right now, but I think it needs to be. And I think the family philanthropy has a lot of work in order to get there.

***Aaron Dorfman***

I think the urgency of many of the problems facing us today is such that, you know, we need many more foundations to increase their spending levels and ultra-high net worth individuals to spend more to get money out there. Do all of them have to do it? No. But we you know, we've got far too many just uncritically defaulting to that 5% spending level. And I think that needs to change. And we need far more to step up, to spend more to address these problems now.

***Salvatore Alaimo***

So let's kind of wrap everything up here and close with what should we do looking out on the horizon and into the future to work towards philanthropy maximizing its capabilities and its role and its impact in this ideal of civil society? You've already mentioned some things, but is there anything else you'd like to add the, to recommend to really have philanthropy take center stage and, and do what it can do?

***Aaron Dorfman***

I'll jump in there Sal. So, a couple of things. One is philanthropy has to get a whole lot better and smarter at how it supports movements. We've seen a lot of progress over the last 15 years in philanthropy's willingness and its competence in funding advocacy. But the sad truth is most of that money went to highly professionalized, mostly white led advocacy organizations. And if you want to drive serious change in our society, yes, you need those highly professionalized advocacy organizations to be well resourced. But you also need the smaller movement organizations led by people of color, to be far better resourced than they currently are. That changes the, the political possibilities of what kinds of policies can get passed. And so, I would hope that in the next five years, the next ten years, we see, you know, quadrupling of philanthropies, resourcing of, of movements. And then the other thing that I think is super important is something Yah-Hannah brought up earlier, and that is reckoning with the wealth creation stories that make philanthropy possible. You know, much of the surplus wealth that gets used for philanthropy was built on the oppression and exploitation and enslavement of black people and on stolen native lands. And I think donors and foundations need to honestly

reckon with that so that we can, you know, begin some racial healing and move society forward.

***Madeleine Williams***

I would echo your remarks about movements, Aaron. That was top of my list when this question was asked. I think back in a way I see from my lens philanthropy needs to think really seriously about the way that it onboards the next generation. We know we're in the largest generational transfer of wealth that we have ever seen and that the next generation and women are going to have more wealth in their hands than ever before. And this is significant. And I think family philanthropy needs to think about the way we onboard the next generation to the table. We need to do it earlier than most people do. We need to think about the way the next generation is educated about things like the systems of philanthropy that we need to change, about movements, about all these other things, because the reality is they're going to be the ones controlling the funds here before we know it and the way that we handle that onboarding is critically important.

***Yah-Hannah Jenkins***

I and I echo everything that Aaron and Maddie said. I think the only thing that I would add would be continuing. Glad We need to continue to explore what democratization of wealth distribution or resource distribution looks like and how decisions are made, who is at the table and just being willing to to lean in intentionally. I know that conversations about risk like when are we taught? When we talk about risk, there are connotations there. There's often, there are often identities that are attached to when an organization or philanthropy think that a risky grant or investment. And I think continuing to lean into to, to, to those conversations, to be willing to have more voices at the table, deciding where and how resources flow. And then I think, you know, just continuing to think about that now. So, there's the reckoning of the past and then there's the continuing extraction and exploitation that's happening right now and then and that continues to build, build wealth for specific within specific communities that work, that continues to flow. And then so that, the, the future of philanthropy looks what the future of our civil society looks like is very heartbreaking as those trends continue. And if we don't, if we aren't willing to lean into conversation about wealth disparity, about extraction of wealth, about exploitation, that's happening right now, then we're going to be having these conversations in the future and many more as that gap continues to expand. So that that would be those would be my, my thoughts.

***Salvatore Alaimo***

Well, I want to thank all of my guests for what I think is a wonderful conversation, thought provoking, intriguing, enlightening on philanthropy's role in civil society. Aaron Dorfman, President and CEO of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. Madeleine Williams, Philanthropic Associate at Strategic Philanthropy Limited. And Yah-Hannah Jenkins, senior program Manager, Miller Knoll Foundation. Thank you all for being on *Tilting The Earth's Praxis*.

***Aaron Dorfman***

Thanks for having us.

***Madeleine Williams***

Great to be here.

***Yah-Hannah Jenkins***

Glad to be here. Thank you.

**Closing music**

***WGVU's Jennifer Moss***

Tilting the Earth's praxis is a GVSU production. The views and opinions expressed in this podcast do not reflect or represent the opinions of Grand Valley State University.

**Closing music fades.**