

Nothing About Us Without Us: Participatory Grant-making to achieve Disability Rights

29 April 2021

This file is being provided in a lightly scanned format to address punctuation and formatting. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) captioning is provided in order to facilitate communication access and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings; this file is intended for use as notes for the recipient. Due to the live nature of the event and the quality of the audio source some names and/or terms may be misspelled.

>>DEBORA: Welcome, everybody.

We'll start slowly, leaving some time for people to join, little by little because we had a lot of interest for this webinar.

Nearly 120 participants registered, so this will take a few seconds more for everybody to join.

In the meanwhile, we can take time for some housekeeping rules.

So welcome to everybody to this webinar, organized by Ariadne, network of social change and human rights funders in collaboration with the participatory grantmaking community of practice, Nothing About Us Without Us, participatory grantmaking to achieve disability rights.

So about the housekeeping rules.

Let's give a few more minutes for participants to join.

To neutralize background noise you are placed in mute but please feel free to unmute yourself and turn on your video at [inaudible] to make a comment.

For that, or also to share useful resources, you can also use the chat bar at the bottom.

You can hear English is not the first language of all participants of this call, so please avoid jargon.

Explain acronyms, and speak clearly and not too quickly so that Shari Majeski, certified realtime our captioner who is working with us today, can capture what you say more easily.

You can view captions in Zoom.

Or, you can also use the URL you have received via email to view captions.

This URL that -- Florent, can you also share it in the chat? It displays captions faster than Zoom, you can see more text and it also scrolls smoother. You can change colors and font size in case you need that.

This webinar is meant to be [unable to hear] a free space for exchange among funders so it is not meant for direct solicitation for funds.

Also, please don't pass on details of the funders participating in the call outside of the network. This is being recorded and it will be shared on -- with other funders through the password protected portal. Please don't share the recorded webinar [unable to hear clearly] beyond the community.

Thanks.

Now, I would like to introduce our moderator for today, Hannah Paterson.

Hi, Hannah.

Hannah started in the Disabled People's Movement in the UK campaigning for rights of disabled students and now works as senior portfolio manager, innovation, policy and practice at the National Lottery Community Fund and is particularly interested in shifting power and participatory grantmaking.

I think more or less everybody will have joined for now.

So, the floor is yours.

>>HANNAH: Hello, everybody.

I'm Hannah. I do work for National Lottery Community Fund.

I'm also one of the founders of the participatory grantmaking community which is a lovely space for anybody who is interested in participatory grantmaking, learning from other funders who are working in that space, sharing research, support, community. And if you are interested in joining the community of practice please do let me know.

I will pop the details in the chat.

We have monthly meetings.

We can catch up with other funders.

Learn more about specific issues and advocate for the practice across the sector.

There is also an active email chain and soon to be a very exciting website that hosts a myriad of research in the space.

So if you are interested in participatory grantmaking, it's the place to be, which is very exciting.

And I'm, yeah, very, very pleased to be joined by some incredible speakers today.

We have Nikki, the program officer for Disability Inclusion Fund at Borealis, which I may or may not have said it correctly.

You can check if I did it wrong, Nikki.

Borealis Philanthropy.

As a person with a disability and a biracial woman, she has devoted work to advancing rights at the intersect of disability justice and racial justice.

Alberto is a Peruvian disability rights advocate and president of -- I'm really sorry, Alberto. Do you want to pronounce the organization's name?

I will butcher it.

>>ALBERTO: Sociedad y Discapacidad.

>>HANNAH: Thank you very much.

And a board member of Disability Rights Fund.

He works as a consultant on disability rights and mental health law and has served in the role as various United Nations entities.

And James, who is a consultant working with various grant funders in the UK and holds a number of non-executive roles with public authorities like Transport for London and Greater London Authority.

He identifies as a disabled person and uses a wheelchair for every day mobility.

Just a note on language. I'm an advocate for self-determination.

People might refer to themselves as disabled people or people with disabilities. I wanted to make it clear

we will use both depending on how people define themselves.

Yeah, thanks for joining us.

It will be great.

Everybody keeps coming in, I get a beep as they come in.

Is everybody else hearing lots of doorbell noises?

No?

Amazing, I will ignore it, keep going.

So I would like to welcome Nikki, Alberto and James.

Can you tell us a bit more about your journey into philanthropy?

And how did you get to work at the intersections of disability, philanthropy and participatory grantmaking?

>>**NIKKI:** Anyone can go first?

>> Go ahead, Nikki!

>>**NIKKI:** Sure.

So, I actually am trained to be a licensed marriage and family therapist here in the U.S.

So I started working in disability probably, oh, close to 20 years at this point.

And I was working as a therapist with people with disabilities specifically with families and just, you know, started kind of working through my career and doing program management, that type of stuff.

And then became an executive director of a disability organization in Berkeley that really focuses on emergency services for people with disability.

I kind of got to philanthropy in a round-about way.

And from that position I really wanted to be on the other side of the picture of not always asking for money but really trying to have some influence on how money is really disbursed throughout the community.

And the Disability Inclusion Fund is focused on participatory grantmaking which intrigued me, because I was new to philanthropy altogether and didn't know that much about participatory grantmaking but now that we have done our first year of grantmaking it totally makes sense to me and I can't really imagine doing it any other way.

You know, there's a lot of power in having the community having influence over the decisions.

And so that is how I kind of got to where I'm at.

>>**HANNAH:** Thanks Nikki.

Alberto, do you want to go next?

>>**ALBERTO:** I think my first encounter with philanthropy was around 2008 when I actually joined disability rights organization in Peru, which I'm the president now.

As Nikki was on the other side of the table, someone receiving funding.

In fact, that is how I got into contact with the Disability Rights Fund, because they were one of the first funders we had.

They were very critical at the moment to the action to change policy.

But later in 2015, I joined Disability Rights Fund Advisory Panel.

Soon after I got into the Grantmaking Committee as representative of [indiscernible] group, people with psychosocial disabilities.

It was for sure a new experience.

It gave me a different perspective on the work in philanthropy but also it got me to learn better how participatory grantmaking works.

You were asking some things I felt.

I think the first one I must confess, I was surprised how much work goes into the whole grantmaking

process.

How much effort people have to put to -- in every grant.

I don't think we see it sometimes on the other side of the table.

And the second thing, it was like you learn about the different competing interests that are always there in terms of deciding about funding from donors asking value for money, disability community having a different approach to it, a more rights-based or justice approach.

Then different marginalized groups that don't feel represented in the mainstream disability community. For me, it was also a learning experience, because I think there is a difficult task in responding to the different competing interests.

Then a third thing I would say that was important for me was learning about actually the power I had, finally, to make decisions about the work I felt compelled.

And you get to decide with your peers about grants.

And sometimes even when you are in the minority position about a grant you get to advocate for them. So I really changed the perspective you have because, as I mentioned in another call we had, for me it's about ownership and responsibility.

You get to sit there, but also it comes with the responsibility of, okay, how to ensure that those we're working for will receive what they need.

And I think that that's really the first thing I got from participatory grantmaking.

You have the responsibility now, because you are representing this community in this space.

>>HANNAH: Amazing, thank you.

James, do you want to go?

>>JAMES: Sure.

I think, much like Alberto, I had a somewhat similar journey into grantmaking.

I previously worked in the voluntary sector as a recipient of funding.

And I had met this great guy called Jared [phonetic] Rafferty who worked for something called the City Bridge Trust who had been funding my post in the voluntary sector.

When I left that post I think rather cynically kept in touch with him because I thought this is someone who has access to lots of money, he is a good person to keep in touch with.

But of course over the years we sort of -- we spoke, and when time came for City Bridge Trust, when they wanted to make a bit of a strategic investment into work that was specifically related to disability, a credit to the trust, they reached out and recognized the importance of both the lived experience and the professional experience and strength of having a disabled person inputting and helping them to manage this program of investment into disability.

They recognized the strength that would bring to where they wanted to spend their money and how they wanted to spend the money.

That was really sort of my entry point into this weird and wonderful world of philanthropy.

I never realized before this was a job people could have, that you would be paid to give money to good causes.

That this was a thing people did for a professional living.

It seemed like it was a world completely unknown to me, even as a recipient of funding.

It had never really occurred to me this is something that was as vast, as intricate, and as well organized at times as it is.

>>HANNAH: Thank, James.

It is interesting to see the synergies, is that the right word?

Themes coming up through the conversation that actually all of us have come into the space from the other side, which is insightful in itself that we distinctly like differentiate between funders and the rest of community which is fantastic, fascinating in itself.

Actually coming to it in a round-about way, brings with it such vast knowledge and learning from different aspects of lived [indiscernible] experience, to create that thing that happens when those things combine and also lots of you recognize or highlighted the shortfalls in philanthropy, recognizing some of the potholes we see from both the other side and internally.

I suppose having been on both sides I'm interested to hear why you guys think that there is such little funding going into the disability sector?

>>ALBERTO: I can go --

>>HANNAH: Go for it!

>>ALBERTO: My impression is the answer is actually quite simple.

It's power.

Like, we don't have, as many people with disabilities -- to frame it differently, as many people identifying with disability, because disability is everywhere, sitting in positions of power.

I think it makes a difference.

We represent at least 50% [phonetic] of the people in the world, and we know we are under-represented among the poor and most excluded, different communities, Black, minorities, Indigenous people, prisoners, homeless people.

And we know about the level of exclusion we face.

Yet, international cooperation is supporting inclusion or rights of people with disabilities is not more than 1% of total donor funding.

It's incredible.

Even when we look at private donors only 2% of the human rights funding, for example -- 2% goes to disability rights.

Or justice.

And I think we can even go farther.

We can look at the quality of funding.

We know much of funding is misdirected to projects not grounded in human rights.

We go even farther, we see many of it goes to non-profits rather than organizations of persons with disabilities.

So there is a big issue there in terms of funding.

We can keep trying to do -- I think participatory grantmaking can help to reduce that gap.

But, at the same time, we really need look at the pie, because we can make things better with money we have but we basically need a lot more funding.

>>JAMES: I think Alberto makes a very good point about power and representation within funders.

[sound of children in background]

I know that there are many funders on this call, I can see today, who have been taking steps toward increasing their knowledge base and bringing that knowledge into their funding process.

I can see [Name] and Tania from Trust for London here who have been doing great things around funding disability rights.

What I find interesting about the question, Hannah, you talk about funding going into disability.

What is our understanding of what we fund, as Alberto says, when we think about what are we funding in disability.

So often I think our approach towards funding disability comes from, and I'm going to slip into jargon here and apologize, but the medical model of disability.

For those not aware there are schools of thought around disability and identity where we talk about something called the social model, which is where we talk about disability being a product of the environment that you are in.

Then you have the medical model, where the disability is held very much seen as a medical thing, as part of the person.

I think that is for many of our colleagues and for many funders who have been working in the space for a very long time, we have had very little exposure to the social model way of thinking, very little exposure to having disabled colleagues.

And our approach to disability, then, comes from a position that it's something we do to other people. Something we fund, you know, our thinking in the space is very much we do unto disabled people rather than we do "with" disabled people.

>>HANNAH: Thank you.

I dropped in the chat, James did a report [inaudible] around barriers for disabled-led organizations.

So I have it in chat if that is interesting. Can't speak today.

Nikki.

Have you anything to add?

>>NIKKI: I think the thing I would add about the conversation is that, you know, the world and certainly the U.S. is a very ableist society.

So disability is often the last thing that people think about and that there is no difference about it in terms of funding.

You know, we're kind of in this movement-building renaissance right now and it shouldn't be about pitting different movements against each other, but about working together.

So really what I -- one of the things I have noticed is that like funders will list in their RFPs, like, we're going to support racial justice, LGBTQ justice and efforts.

But they often forget disability.

It is like not even a thought -- part of their thought process.

And so I think one of the things that is so important about philanthropy and really addressing this is that we kind of have to start thinking about it from within the organization and really trying to transform foundations themselves in terms of, like, their hiring practices, hiring people with disabilities. And this participatory grantmaking process is really I think bringing that to the forefront.

That if you're going to fund to disability organizations you have to really think about having people on your staff and using a participatory grantmaking process to really see what -- the totality of what disability is.

>>HANNAH: That was an excellent segue.

Almost as if you planned it, Nikki!

Next question I've got for you guys is how participatory grantmaking has helped kind of build disability rights and justice, and how it has helped inform work you are doing, or the way we are funding differently in this space.

Do you want to go, Nikki, as you set us up for that so delightfully!

>>NIKKI: Sure.

Well, I think what is really interesting about that is from the fund that I'm managing, Disability Inclusion Fund, we were thinking about this from the very beginning, about how we can really use our power and -- to really build out the sector.

Build out the funding for the disability communities.

And really, like, from my perspective, when I'm thinking about funding I'm thinking how can we really develop the field of disability rights and disability justice and as I'm picking -- looking through -- as we are working through the process of funding, really thinking about organizations that are really at the forefront of disability rights and disability justice.

Our fund really leans toward disability justice.

And in order to, like, do that we have to really think broadly and about how we view disability and not just think about, like, as James was talking about, the charity model of disability.

Like funding things like research and service programs.

But thinking about funding things more broadly.

Like we have in our last cohort, we had like five arts-based organizations.

So, really thinking about disability as a much bigger, broader, you know, category in terms of, like, our funding.

>>**HANNAH:** Thanks, Nikki.

Alberto, do you want to touch on how you think participatory grantmaking has helped to [indiscernible] justice and disabled people?

>>**ALBERTO:** Yeah.

I agree with Nikki on how different spaces, different agendas.

Because basically it makes philanthropy more responsive and relevant to people.

I think in particular what I have seen is how participatory grantmaking can help to ensure a more strong human rights-based approach to disability.

That, at least in international context, it would mean embracing the principles and standards of the Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities, no?

And as I mentioned before, there are many funds going to projects that actually are not based on such principles.

Going to institutions, a special occasion, or [indiscernible] work.

So I think it helps to ensure, having people on board, it helps to ensure we pay attention to rights and inclusion.

And in the right way, no.

And basically who knows better, no?

People with disabilities working on the ground.

But even if you don't focus as an organization providing funding on disability rights, I think participatory grantmaking can make a difference, no, for disability justice.

Whether you work on occasion, housing, climate change.

Having people with disabilities sitting there will help [indiscernible] disability in the work people do.

Something to react to in the last question, I didn't have the time, is that if we don't invest in people with disability, we're affecting everybody, all groups.

I think the exclusion gap will be broader.

We talk about we need to achieve the SDGs, Sustainable Development Goals, but if we don't include people with disabilities that is not going to happen. Exclusion is very high, no.

>>**JAMES:** There is something there about Alberto said about making philanthropy more responsive which I think is at the heart of the value of participatory grantmaking.

We all want to make sure we spend money effectively and spend our money well.

I think that that is the real strength of involving the voices of the people we are trying to support,

communities we are trying to support, in the way in which we shape our spending.

It gives us the opportunity to really tap into the knowledge.

To say what is going to make the biggest difference to you in your life.

It is far less of doing unto, and much more of doing "with" that is the really important thing for every funder present I think on this call.

Whether you are funding disability rights, justice, or something entirely else like race, equality issues, climate change.

Working with affected communities and really valuing that knowledge.

>>**HANNAH:** Thanks, James.

I suppose this talks to the wider -- and you both touched on this throughout the questions you asked, and also the introduction pieces, around actually how has this approach changed and challenged philanthropy. How have you seen it impact the work outside or within organizations.

>>**JAMES:** Yeah. Really interesting movement happening certainly in the UK at least, with things like Project 2027.

Where we are trying to actively improve diversity amongst funders in terms of what our staff looks like.

I think it's a really important point in there for funders.

I can't think of a single funder who will say "no, we don't want more -- we don't want greater knowledge, we don't want greater diversity". I think every funder out there wants that.

I think the barrier there is trying to source that, I guess, -- in other words talent.

Trying to source the people coming into your organization to bring knowledge and expertise.

You know, we talk about spending money to make money.

Well, I think in philanthropy we need to talk about spending money to spend money wisely.

Things like 2027, supporting other capacity-building, diversity-encouraging initiatives is a really important thing for funders to do.

>>**HANNAH:** Nikki, Alberto?

Do either of you have anything to add in?

>>**NIKKI:** I would just want to add about the capacity building.

You know, that is so important in terms of grantmaking because so often -- I definitely noticed this when I was on the other side of the philanthropy.

It was like foundations would support programs, but they wouldn't support capacity building.

And that is just hugely important, because what ends up happening for organizations is they end up, like, trying to find money to just do things like hire a good bookkeeper, you know?

So we really need to -- I feel like that is starting to shift a little bit, but that foundations really need to think about how they support capacity building for organizations, particularly disability organizations.

Because a lot of disability organizations are very much at the grassroots level.

And if you can't, you know, think about how you do -- kind of run your organization on a very basic level, it's really hard to focus your energy on programs.

It just kind of spreads organizations too thin.

And so I think really that foundations and funders really need to shift their thinking about not just supporting programs but maybe shifting to do a little more capacity building, general operating support and funding.

>>**HANNAH:** Thanks Nikki.

Alberto?

>>**ALBERTO:** I feel that participatory grantmaking, when you think about -- you were asking about change

and how we challenge philanthropy.

I think participatory grantmaking requires something that is very important, which is humility and knowledge in the people we fund are the experts on their lives and they should decide what the best thing is to do, what should be the course of action to transform what we want to transform, no?

I think that changes everything.

It challenges philanthropy objectives.

For example, in the field of disability, we were talking about this, it's moving from this charity approach to a rights-based approach.

But those are challenges that funding relationship, from beneficiaries to partners.

I think to build meaningful partnerships.

But I will also emphasize something that Nikki was mentioning in terms of the methods.

I think capacity building is one aspect that is always forgotten.

But even just the burdensome forms, procedures, requirements people have to go through.

I think that is also challenged by participatory grantmaking because it requires or at least inputs through people participating that we want something that responds to people's needs and is accessible for everyone, no?

And sometimes I think funders don't realize that just an inaccessible website could be a big barrier for accessing funding.

Even if you go through a very detailed analysis for approving each grant like we do in DRF we don't want to put the burden on grantees because we know what it means for them. And I think that's already a big change.

>>HANNAH: I find it fascinating in participatory grantmaking is when you bring communities together to make decisions you benefit from the wisdom and wealth they bring in the space.

I think we found at the National Lottery Community Fund, regardless of what program it is, if we have disabled people involved in the decision making process it brings a different element to the work and the discussions and the way that we do things.

So for our last round of lived experience program, we continuously went back to the fact that all of these grants coming in around youth work, mental health, criminal justice support, none of [indiscernible] acknowledging disabled people are involved in the projects, how can we support organizations that don't have a specific disability lens to be able to accommodate and build in access requirements into their work. It meant because we had the discussion so much with the panel that we gave up less to all of those grants at the end of the process so they all received an extra 5,000 pounds on top of the grant they received to build in access requirements to enable the community theater or youth project to be accessible to disabled people.

I think it is a really nice -- or like a thing that funders should be thinking about as we do, we will look at a number, say it's too expensive without acknowledging the cost that it is to be accessible and how do we build it into all of our programs regardless.

And we are going to go to questions in a little bit.

So this is the bit where it becomes stressful for me as moderator to keep up with your chat.

Always an awkward four minutes where nobody says anything, so I ask you to start to put stuff in the chat and as we go.

I just wanted to ask a final question as we do it, before we open up, around what does participatory grantmaking you have been involved with look like?

How does disability rights do it, or how does the work you are involved in, what does it look like?

A snapshot so people have an idea of how the two things connect and complement each other.

Who wants to go first?

Free for all!

>>NIKKI: I will talk about that.

I'm actually ramping up for the next grantmaking round.

So I think we really thought about this very intentionally from the very beginning of the development of the fund.

Part of that process is we did a landscape analysis in which we hired a consultant to interview activists in the disability justice community.

Some things that really came out in that landscape analysis we really put into action in our grantmaking process.

So, some things that came out were applications needed to be in accessible formats.

It seems such a simple thing!

I'm always surprised when I talk to foundations, they are like, wow, we didn't even think about that.

So we offer our applications not only in -- on our portal but they can submit through a Google form, a Word doc, they can even do a video submission.

Or even to sit down and do an extended phone call to -- as an accommodation for doing the application.

Another thing that we do is we, you know, offer a webinar on our application process so that prospective grantees can really ask questions.

Just to remove another step in between, kind of make the process more open and accessible.

And what we do with our fund is we are unique in we have both funders and advocates on our grantmaking committee.

So we did an open call for advocates to want to be on our Grantmaking Committee.

And then the funders donating directly to our fund also have opportunity to be on the Grantmaking Committee.

So we kind of have an equal representation between funders and advocates.

And which is, I think, you know, really unique.

And but what we have really found in the process is that it really opened up the discussion between funders and advocates.

Like, they could really see what was going on from all the different sides of grantmaking.

So that was really, I think, important to the participatory grantmaking process for our particular fund, was to have funders and advocates in the room together talking through and making decisions.

And just having advocates on the -- on our committee really going through applications.

That was also just a really huge part of our process.

And we are still, you know, working with -- like as our next step after we made our decisions and now working with our grantees, sort of our advocates are also still involved with helping us think through some of the things that some of our grantees are needing for -- in how to use their funds to their best -- in the best ways.

>>HANNAH: Thanks, Nikki.

Do either of you two want to chip in before questions?

I say that. You don't have to chip in if you don't want to. But Alberto, James, do you have anything to add about models or using participatory grantmaking or have seen it used that's very good?

>>JAMES: I will chip in a little about some work I do at City Bridge Trust.

So at City Bridge Trust I think we are still on the journey of exploring some of the ideas around participatory

grantmaking, trying to learn more, trying to figure how it best works with some of what we do. But I will speak specifically about the program we're funding that I manage for City Bridge Trust which is all about funding disability and employment.

As part of the creation of the program I know we spoke to -- it was -- speak to disabled people, to give weight to their opinions.

The trust is fortunate to have as a trustee the City of London Corporation, which is a large local authority. We spoke to disability staff network there.

We spoke to various stakeholders [indiscernible]

the trust or corporation who identified as disabled people who worked in the space.

We spoke to potential grantees as well.

We -- it's the first time -- and we got lots [indiscernible] feedback that we incorporated into the program, so it's the first time the trust funded projects for five years as opposed to three.

It was based on feedback that when you are working in the space of disability and employment with disabled people, sometimes the outcomes you are looking for take longer.

It was recognized it was important to fund for a longer period of time.

It is taking nuggets of information that came from speaking with the people we wanted to fund.

And speaking with people who had that lived or professional experience around this space that we were able to put together what I think is a pretty good program of funding.

>>HANNAH: Alberto?

I mean, you don't have to if you don't want to, but feel free.

>>ALBERTO: I would like to mention something following this conversation in terms of -- so, the Disability Rights Fund is doing now this research project on evaluating the experience of participatory grantmaking and learning from it.

For me, being involved in that process, it is interesting to see, for me, how the perceptions also of grantees about how participatory approaches are important across the whole grantmaking cycle.

It's not just about having someone like me sitting in the Grantmaking Committee, but it's also having people in the board -- well, now I'm in the board. Just joining.

But, having people, staff with disabilities, all of that makes a big difference in terms of how participatory approach is to people with disabilities.

For me, that has been a very important feedback from that process.

I mean, personally, I had a very positive experience in the Grantmaking Committee.

But I think we need to also think even beyond that.

It's not just having people sitting at the moment of making decisions but in general how your whole process is participatory I think is important.

>>HANNAH: Definitely.

I think the language stuff is interesting around participatory grantmaking.

Not only is it horrible to say and spell, but how do we start to think about it.

For us in the participatory grantmaking community it's around enabling people to find their folks.

If you are involved in participatory grantmaking it's a good catch, but being aware that language isn't necessarily fit for purpose everywhere.

What are we talking about when we talk about participatory grantmaking?

Is it the end point or middle point where someone says yes or no to funding.

Or is it about how we involve people through the strategy design, monitoring, and evaluation reporting.

What does it look like thinking about philanthropy in the entire cycle.

Or ultimately if we think about philanthropy in a cycle, how do we re-imagine what it looks like, and not just redesign participation into traditional methods of philanthropy and really look at how do we change the way that we do grantmaking so communities can design, own, and shift where the power is so we're not just shoehorning people into a system that already exists.

With a flurry of questions!

I'm going to go to Tania first.

You emailed questions in advance, which was wonderful, thank you so much.

And you and Shonette [phonetic spelling] have been leading the charge in the space in the UK.

It would be wonderful to hear from you.

One or two of the questions you have for the panel.

You are on mute, Tania.

>> Thank you very much, Hannah.

Am I there?

Okay.

>>**HANNAH:** You are good!

>>**TANIA:** We actually come from a different perspective.

Our program, we were becoming increasingly aware that years and years of austerity were actually creating serious holes in the advances of disability rights movement in the UK.

Because we set up a rights program.

We set up a rights program, we feel the only way we could set it up was make it very participatory.

So we got a panel of deaf and disabled people who had been advising us and been participating in every step of the way.

From articulating the approach, how we go about it, all the way to decision-making.

It's been a very, very, very interesting journey and we're still learning loads and getting it wrong, trying it again, and the rest.

I asked three questions. Perhaps only entitled to one, yes!

Um, let's see ...

>>**HANNAH:** If you go for one, I will cover some end questions, whatever you didn't cover I will --

>>**TANIA:** Right, right.

This one issue I would like to share with the panel, really.

Is when we try to gather a group of people, diverse people with diverse experiences, and of course we never meant to have a representative [indiscernible] but we are always aware that certain voices are not there.

And how can we make sure -- I mean, we listen to the diversity within the community, disabled community. The other thing is that we -- a question that perhaps I did not ask, but it is about -- something we are reflecting a lot.

Hannah mentioned.

It's about engaging in this process without answering the underpinning process of the organization we belong to.

Ultimate fiscal and legal responsibility, we have a committee that takes decision on our disability program.

But -- and decisions are ratified by our trustees.

But the trustees have prerogative of saying no.

They haven't, but what I'm saying is, are we really shifting power?

That is the question.

If anybody has gone through a similar process, it would be lovely to hear from you.

>>**HANNAH:** Don't know if anybody wants to respond to that one?

Around are we actually really shifting power, if we have board sign-off to grants.

>>**JAMES:** Interesting one.

It goes back to the idea of what is philanthropy all about really?

Is this just a wonderful -- if you look at the origins of lots of modern philanthropy, it's just a wonderful PR exercise for people who have really exploited the system to make ludicrous amounts of money and are now fending off the hordes of unhappy peasants, of which I very much consider myself to be an unhappy peasant, from the amounts of money they amassed by exploiting their fellow human beings. Sorry, that's a slightly cynical take.

But it's kind of the -- that's the foundation of a lot of modern philanthropy, isn't it?

It's about doing things that look nice, that sound nice, that buy the good will of the people.

So Tania's question about power in philanthropy, I think of course we want to see much better representation on trustee boards, staff teams, so forth. Shonette asked the question in the chat about the ultimate goal of PGM movement.

I do think the ultimate goal is better representation across your trustee board, your staff team. And participatory grantmaking is a good activity and a good step on the way to getting there.

Something that sort of helps to bring, to slowly make the shift amongst funders.

>>**HANNAH:** Nikki?

Alberto?

Alberto has a hand.

>>**ALBERTO:** Yeah, I actually wanted to react to the first question in terms of help ensure diversity. It's a difficult process.

Because I think embracing diversity in general is always a process, because there is always people we're missing, there is always privilege and power dynamics there.

I think we have to keep aware of that.

And I think it is a process also because you, in the process of engaging, engaging, you will create institutional memory about -- you learn.

Then even if people leave?

The trust or Grantmaking Committee, whatever you have, the learning will be there.

I think having that permanent rotation, being open to have different groups, it helps the institutional memory to grow and have a broader understanding of diversity.

From the question on shifting of power, I think Diana was mentioning [indiscernible the decisions about grants were moved from the board to the Grantmaking Committee, so the Grantmaking Committee could make the final decisions about [indiscernible].

I think that is already a good indication of shifting power.

As somebody that was on the Grantmaking Committee, I remember a couple of times, not often, we don't agree sometimes.

And you can see, then, the dynamics between some donors and some representative from marginalized groups that we may have different opinions.

At some point I think it helps to change sometimes decisions.

I think at the end that is the important part.

Because sometimes we have -- that is why I mention it.

I think sometimes we had different interests in terms of what we want to fund and why.

And different perspectives are valid all the time.

And that is the collaborative process.

But sometimes you get shift of power, to say, no, in this case we're going to go for it, even if some of your concerns will not be addressed at this moment.

I think there is clearly a shift of power.

In those specific situations that I found.

But that comes with empowerment too, no, to have people in power to fight for it, too.

>>HANNAH: We have load of questions.

This is the point I get overwhelmed.

I will throw some out Nikki and you can work out whether any of these take your fancy and which one you might want to come in on.

You had a question from Diana about what does the future of philanthropy look like?

We had a question around some challenges of doing participatory grantmaking.

I will plug the participatory grantmaking community again.

It's a great place to answer and ask all of these questions.

If that one isn't picked up, we can send you details of getting involved with that.

We had a question about barriers, how to make it more accessible.

So Nikki, if any of those pique interest or you want to throw your [indiscernible] any of them?

>>NIKKI: Those are all really great questions!

I think how participatory grantmaking is going to shift philanthropy is a really interesting question.

Making things more accessible.

You know, I feel like -- and also bouncing back from the last question, is that we have to really push foundations to have better representation within their staff and their boards.

I mean, I think it is something Borealis does well.

We have pretty good representation on our board as well as all of our funds are led by people that are directly involved or have been affected in the movements that they are supporting.

And I think -- just think we have to keep pushing foundations to do that.

And when they say they can't find people that are representative of whatever funding priority they are working on?

I just really think that is -- that they are not trying hard enough.

And that we just have to make them try harder.

I really firmly believe that.

That there are definitely good people out there.

If they are not finding them, they are just not working hard enough at it.

And then in terms of making it a process more accessible.

Like I said, we really worked very, very hard at making sure that every aspect of our grantmaking was accessible.

In terms of, you know, basic things like the applications.

We're getting ready to do a convening with grantees and are making every part of that, you know, accessible.

From our written materials to making our presenters make sure their materials are accessible.

And you know, even choosing not to have a particular presenter if they're not -- can't do that, then we will find someone else who can.

For us it's like the bottom line is, if you are not willing or able to make something accessible, you are not

trying hard enough.

Or, we have to figure out how to do that.

I think that foundations across the board just have to be committed to doing that.

We have to push them to do that.

>>HANNAH: Thanks.

Alberto, James.

Do you want me to repeat questions?

Was there anything there that piqued your interest you want to tap into?

The question Diana asks, about what does the future look like and how do we think, reimagine something different, I'm always fascinated by.

>>JAMES: Really good question.

I wanted to jump in on that one as well.

Earlier, Hannah, you talked about the work you had done at the National Lottery Community Fund to make sure that some of what would have been considered mainstream program, although I hate the segregation between mainstream and [indiscernible] making sure they are accessible to all.

I think it's an important point about disability inclusion, philanthropy, that we make sure that work that isn't necessarily targeted at disabled people is still accessible to disabled people.

And making sure that the groups we work with have the knowledge to do that, they have access to the advice to do that.

Importantly, access to the funds to make sure that what they are funding is accessible.

I think when we talk about the future of disability --

[sounds of children in background]

-- inclusion, philanthropy, we've got to think about where disabled people are coming from in the first place. We are cohort of people who sometimes -- and not always the case, but quite often, as Alberto mentioned before, we are in the lowest income indexes.

We face poverty.

We face significant barriers to progression in the workplace and so forth.

We come from a position of unequal starting point.

Which is why there is so little in terms of disability rights, disability campaigning, disability justice that is out there.

Because disabled people are still struggling just to make ends meet and to live.

You know, being involved in things like these discussions of the future of philanthropy, it's a great luxury if you are able to do it, if you have the time and capacity to do so.

Really important to recognize that we are not all starting from the same equal points.

>>HANNAH: Thank you, James. I appreciate -- [difficult audio] your kids, always a pleasure to see.

Alberto, anything to add in?

>>ALBERTO: I was thinking about these questions also, in terms of where we go here.

I think James laid very strong foundations for it.

I think in terms what does it mean, disability inclusion, in general?

How we can move forward?

I think it is important not to forget this very important principles on disability inclusion.

One is mainstreaming for sure.

We need everybody working on philanthropy thinking about disability.

Justice.

But also, we want of course accessibility.

But not just accessibility for access funding, but also of what you are funding.

Because we know many things are being funded and not accessible, or not benefitting people with disabilities.

From community centers to education tools.

So we need to ensure that is accessible also.

I think everything comes down to this principle of non-discrimination.

That we take it for granted.

Because we have a very [indiscernible] view of non-discrimination but when we have an understanding of non-discrimination, then we have a different approach.

We think about intersectional approaches that we need to ensure in this process.

For sure, again, we think of disability inclusion, we want something that will help people to participate.

Like this is the purpose, and this really means changing approaches.

>>HANNAH: Thank you.

I have been thinking a lot about actually how as funders we have a responsibility to think about the harm that often decisions make.

Like funding one thing might be good for someone but might be extremely harmful for another.

How do you start to kind of think about not just what is in front of you on the application form or proposal, but impacts on different people.

So I think it's a good challenge.

We are two minutes to the hour.

Coming up to the end of our chat.

It's been so nice to chat about this stuff with you guys.

I want to, one, say a massive thank you to Nikki, James, Alberto, to Shari for captioning, for Flo and Debora at Ariadne for helping set it up.

And I think it's something we should talk about more.

So I'm kind of making a concerted effort at this point to be profiling, and sharing, and broadcasting and promoting the incredible work in the space, people in the space.

I think I'll be in touch with a couple of you on the call around future webinars, catchups, ways we can engage people in the conversation about how do we do better.

And a plug for the participatory grantmaking community. It is lovely.

Our next meeting is next week, about peer support.

We also have learning events coming up in the future.

That are accessible to all.

Particularly looking at the future of participatory grantmaking in July.

A session with Edward and Edgar, from colonizing wealth and participatory grantmaking, how the two complement each other.

A set in the pipeline around young people and participatory grantmaking, how children and young people can be deciders of where funding goes.

There was something else on the list I have forgotten!

If you are interested in any of the events, check our exciting brand-new website.

Follow us on Twitter if interested.

PGM.comm. And com is with two M's.

Debora, anything I missed you would like to throw in?

>>DEBORA: Just a big thank you to all of you, including you Hannah, for wonderful moderation and facilitation.

And indeed, at Ariadne we have a couple of communities which could be relevant for the work which are the disability community and the [indiscernible] community.

And nothing -- [indiscernible, difficult audio] and related issues like on -- we have a series of webinars ongoing.

The next will be about funding with racial justice lens.

Hope to see you there.

The next occasion!

Thank you, Hannah.

[Event concluded]