Emily Harris:

Welcome to the first 2022 session of the Disability and Philanthropy Forum's Journey to Inclusion series. My name is Emily Harris. I use she/her pronouns and I'm proud to be part of the disability community. I am the Executive Director of the Disability and Philanthropy Forum, and I come to you from the unseated land of the Council of Three Fires, the Odawa, Ojibwe, and Potawatomi nations, now known as Chicago. My access needs are met today with live captioning. As part of our commitment to accessibility, our speakers and I will each provide a short audio description. I'm a white woman with dark curly hair wearing rectangular glasses and a black and pink check shirt. Behind me is a screen made of rectangles of blonde wood and white paper.

Emily Harris:

A few housekeeping items for today's learning session. The recording of today's session will focus on the speakers and moderator. There may be one or two moments when we show gallery view. Feel free to leave your camera off if you have any concerns. You will receive a link to the recorded parts of the session in approximately 10 days. We have live captioning today. There are two ways to access these captions. Use the CC button at the bottom of your screen and choose subtitles or full transcript, which will pop up as a box in your Zoom screen. If you prefer to access the captions in a separate window, a link to the external captioner is now in the chat.

Emily Harris:

During the first portion of our program today, we will be spotlighting our speakers and you'll be muted. After about 35 minutes of moderated discussion, there will be a question and answer session. You can place questions in the chat and our moderator and speaker will address as many questions as we can. We truly want this to be a conversation. We'll also use the chat throughout this session to share links to information, and you can use it to post questions at any time. You can also send questions to communications@disabilityphilanthropy.org. That address is also in the chat.

Emily Harris:

This guest session is scheduled for 90 minutes, but we understand that some people have a hard stop after 60 minutes and will include the formal program by then. We'll pause a couple of minutes before 1:00 PM Eastern for a moment with a few announcements, and then continue an optional conversation from 1:00 to 1:30 for those of you who can stay. This will be our time to interact directly with the panelists. During that time, we will continue taking questions in the chat, but we really hope you'll come off of mute and share your questions and talk with us. The program will wrap up no later than 1:30 Eastern time.

Emily Harris:

Before I introduce our moderator, I want to highlight a few things. First, disability is a natural part of the human experience, and there are more than 60 million of us in the US alone. Disabilities can be apparent or non-apparent, lifelong or acquired. And disability identity is only one part of each person's identity. We represent all aspects of diversity.

Emily Harris:

Second, like other forms of oppression, the barriers to full participation in our society are socially constructed and can be dismantled if we are intentional. Finally, we recognize the founding disability rights and justice principle, nothing about us without us. Today you'll hear from leaders with disabilities who have experience with participatory disability grantmaking.

Emily Harris:

Without further ado, I am thrilled to introduce our moderator for today. My colleague, Emily Ladell, who is the Disability and Philanthropy Forum's Digital Content and Community Manager, and author of Demystifying Disability. Her bio is in the chat, as are all of our speakers. Again, feel free to use the chat at any time during the discussion to post your questions. And we will hold them for a question-and-answer period at the end.

Emily Harris:

Emily, you're on.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so much, Emily. And hello everyone again. My name is Emily Ladell. My pronouns are she/her. Quick visual description of myself. I am a white woman. I'm wearing glasses. I have brown hair that's pulled back. I've got on a yellow shirt and a pair of pink headphones. And my background behind me is blurred. I come to you from Long Island, New York, which is the unseated territory of the Massapequas. I am incredibly, incredibly excited to engage in this conversation today because the value of participatory grantmaking is something that we absolutely must be talking about in philanthropy. And I couldn't think of three better people to be part of this conversation. So, I first want to turn it over to each of our wonderful panelists to give a brief introduction of themselves. And then we will launch into what I know will be an incredibly powerful conversation.

Emily Ladell:

So Carrie, can we start with you for an introduction please?

Carrie Thompson:

Thank you. Hi everyone. I'm Carrie Thompson. I come to you from the land of the Massachusetts people, just outside of Boston. My pronouns are she/her. And my video description is that I'm a white woman wearing headphones and wearing a floral top. Behind me is a clock to my left and some dishes being displayed on my right side. I'm a person with deaf-blindness. And from time to time, you will notice that I'm going to be moving my head off screen a little bit as I'm assessing the external captions on an external device. So yes, that complicated. And my title is the Inclusion and Accessibility Development Manager for the Disability Rights Fund, where I am proud to be a team member of since the beginning in 2008. Thank you, Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so much, Carrie. And Katie, would you introduce yourself too?

Katie Murphy:

Sure. Hi, I am Katie Murphy. As of Monday, I am now the co-Chair of the WITH Foundation Self Advocate Advisory Committee. I also serve on the Stakeholder Advisory Group for Ability Central. I am an autistic self advocate and union activist. By day, I work at San Francisco State University in an office doing officey things. And you can refer to me by the pronouns she/her/hers. I'm coming to you from the occupied territory of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who along with the Coastal Miwok and the Southern Pomo are organized as the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria. I am a white person in early thirties with shaggy red hair and glasses. And for my access needs, I may turn my camera off from time to time to move around.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so much, Katie. And Keedra, last but not least.

Keedra Cheney:

Hi, everyone. Thanks Emily. My name is Keedra Cheney. My pronouns are she/her. My visual description is I'm a black woman with white cateye glasses. I'm wearing a green head wrap, and a blue dress with a white scallop top. Back of me is a wall with black and white wallpaper. And I'm wearing aqua blue headphones. I'm coming to you from the unseated land of the Council of the Three Fires, Ojibwe, Odawa and Potawatomi nations, also known as Chicago, Illinois. My day job is I am Digital Engagement and Accessibility Manager at the National Network of Abortion Funds. Relevant to our panel today, I was a 2021 Borealis Philanthropy Disability Inclusion Fund committee grantmaking member as an advocate. And my access needs are currently being met, though I may have to turn off the camera a couple times to handle some things. Thank you, Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so much, everybody. And now I would actually like to take a moment to back up a bit. So you all shared the ways in which the work that you do is connected to participatory grantmaking, but can we talk about what exactly that means and how that process works? Why is it such a vital practice? We would love to hear right from people who are deeply and meaningfully involved in this work, what it actually means to be a participatory grantmaker. And so, Keedra, I would love to turn it over to you first.

Keedra Cheney:

Well, the description of participatory grantmaking is that it is an approach that involves not just grantmakers, but the constituents and the people that are affected by grantmaking within the grantmaking process. So in my case, as a committee member, there was a call that was made by Borealis for advocates to join a committee. And I, as a member and a former fellow of an organization that was a fundee of Borealis disability lead that's based in Chicago, they reached out to me and asked if I would be interested in applying to participate. As somebody who was a member of disability lead as an organization, but also from my semi-connected background, working in abortion funds as a disabled woman.

Keedra Cheney:

So I was really interested in participating in the committee because it was about including affected people as agents have changed within the organization, to be able to identify other like-minded organizations and efforts that are being done cross movement wide, across the disability justice landscape. This process is really about trying to get recommendations that really speak to the diversity, the intersectionality of the movement right now. And it was really exciting for me to be a part of it.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so much for sharing a little bit about the process and what led you to become engaged in that process. And so, Katie, I would like to turn this question to you as well. So how do you explain participatory grantmaking? And also I'd add to that because Keedra was touching on it, what led you to become engaged in this particular process?

Katie Murphy:

Sure. Well, I'm coming from the developmental disability community, specifically the kind of the autistic self advocate community. So our take on participatory grantmaking may be a little bit different because what we're thinking about is less about putting the power back into the hands of grantees of the organizations that are doing the work, but actually putting the power back into the hands of the community. Because within the developmental disability community, as well as within other disability communities, we are not the people who are leading the organizations that are getting money. There's just maybe... that are actually led by people with developmental disabilities and the rest are led by other people speaking for us.

Katie Murphy:

So at WITH, one of the hallmarks of that organization is using philanthropy to actually guide the projects that are being done around this population, around this community. So we do that through a self advocate advisory committee that looks at all of the grant proposals, that gives feedback on all of them, that ranks them, that has a meeting with our executive director to discuss them and give our misgivings or our constructive criticism. And the idea really is that through a carrot approach, we're able to guide the types of projects that are happening, so that they actually are representing the interest of developmentally disabled people.

Katie Murphy:

So from that perspective, I see community participatory grantmaking as a way for funders to use their financial assets to actually move the needle towards what the community wants. And the community has the expertise, the foundations have the money, and also the staffing that comes along with that as well as some expertise themselves. But it's really the advisory groups and the community participants who're able to push things in a way that a foundation alone wouldn't be able to do.

Katie Murphy:

And I personally ended up getting involved because when I was in school, I went to the Autistic Self Advocacy Network's Autistic Campus Inclusion Summer Academy, which was basically a 10-day training for becoming a self advocate on your college campus and more broadly. And when the WITH Foundation was looking for new members of its advisory committee, it reached out to ASAN and then I got involved with WITH. And then from WITH, they referred me to Ability Central. And it's just been word of mouth buzz about Katie Murphy ever since.

Emily Ladell:

Katie, thank you so much for sharing more about both the process and also how you became involved in it. And finally, Carrie, I would love for you to give some insight as well on the process of participatory grantmaking, and also how you came to this work.

Carrie Thompson:

Thank you, Emily. This is Carrie speaking, and it's such a pleasure to be here with you all today. Disability Rights Fund has been one of the early pioneers of participatory grantmaking. And for DRF, that model looks like having persons with disabilities on a staff, having persons with disabilities on our grantmaking committee, and having persons with disabilities on our board of directors. There is also a space for grantee to give their feedback and input, to help drive our grantmaking principles and guidelines. We also make sure that we are working with the local organization on the ground.

Carrie Thompson:

And for example, we are an international grantmaker. And with that means that we also work to have program officers who are based in the country where we are providing funding. Those program officers also had disabilities and who better to be positioned to understanding the disability landscape than persons with disabilities in their countries.

Carrie Thompson:

What led me to this work really was kind of by accident. I was in my last semester in grad school. And I was just learning about this organization that was being put together. The founding Executive Director, Diana Samarasan, was putting together this organization that was going to have two different concepts that really, really appealed to me.

Carrie Thompson:

The first was trying to make sure that people could understand and address disability as an humanized issue, which was sort of a paradigm shift for myself as well. And then the second concept was that this conversation was going to be driven by persons with disabilities. It was going to be at the very core of everything we do. And it was first driven by 12 people on the global advisory panel, which consisted of originally nine activists with disabilities and three bridge builders. Then we also had the grantmaking committee, which included four seats for activists with disabilities, as well as donor representative. We also have a board of director where our bylaws says that 50% of the board members have to be a person with a disability. Plus one person with the disability is the co-chair always.

Carrie Thompson:

And the other thing that was really important for understanding the participatory model is understanding collaboration. We wanted to see more collaboration between different movement, which was part of why we had bridge builders. Our principal has evolved a little bit over the years, and so now, we have restructured. So the global advisory panel has been broken down a little bit so that we created more space on the grantmaking committee, increasing the number of seats for activists with disabilities to now be six. And we are no longer trying to look at it as an advisory strategy, but really putting the decision-making power with the activist with disabilities on the grantmaking committee.

Carrie Thompson:

And the grantmaking committee, how it looks is that our international program officers put forward recommendations, and these recommendations are reviewed by the grantmaking committee. They have an opportunity to give their input and feedback to help drive a stronger mission. And it's such a critical piece of work to do. And I guess one part that we haven't quite addressed is why this is so important.

Carrie Thompson:

And I can give an example from just the history of looking at these grantmaking committees and how sometimes donor representative, who are funding disability rights, have not talked with persons with disabilities. And in one instance, one donor was supporting mental health laws in a country and had not consulted with persons with disabilities until they heard one of the activists with a psychosocial disabilities discussing the harm for nature of mental health laws. And this was sort of an aha moment in understanding why it's so important to hear directly from communities. And it's just amazing to me to look back at 15 years of, I can't picture any other way of grantmaking. How can you not be using the participatory model. Back to you, Emily,

Emily Ladell:

Carrie, thank you so, so much. And being mindful of time, I want to make sure we jump right into the next question. So I'd love to talk a little bit about some of the key lessons that you've all learned and taken away when it comes to participatory grantmaking. And as we were all planning for this conversation, there were a lot of things that came up, issues of a diversity of identities being represented within participatory grantmaking committees, or unfortunately, sometimes the lack thereof. There's been a lot of conversation around power dynamics that this brings up. And of course privilege. So I would really love to hear some of the insights that you've taken away from the participatory grantmaking process, so that we can all benefit from these key lessons. So Keedra, I will turn it over to you first.

Keedra Cheney:

Thanks, Emily. So a lot of my experience comes from somebody who is both inside the disability justice movement, but outside of it. As I mentioned before, I work at a reproductive justice organization. So I don't have the direct organizational stake that folks that are doing on-the-ground DJ work are doing. But I think a lot about the folks who do have that organizational stake and how they are being included in the process of participatory grantmaking. I'm a black woman. So there's that intersectional identity that comes from that. But I still come from a place of privilege being grad school educated-
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Keedra Cheney:

I still come from a place of privilege being grad school educated, middle class, I have a professional job. I have the time to give to something like this in a way that other on the ground, activists and advocates may not be able to give. And I think that, especially with these kind of participatory committees, just the self selection process ends up excluding a lot of folks who are working class, who don't necessarily have the time and space to give to a volunteer project like this, because they're out there doing the work right now.

Keedra Cheney:

And I think that's something that came into play even with the committee that I was in that was broken up with six advocates and I believe four folks from other parts of the philanthropic community, along with the Borealis staff, I think there was a lot of discussion about who was at the table, who was able to make those determinations about who is doing DJ, who is out there doing disability justice work and what kind of barriers that even we, with our mostly professional background may not be seeing about what's going on within the movement on a broader level.

Keedra Cheney:

I am also from Chicago. And I think that there's an issue of location and just how movement spaces work regionally. The Midwest doesn't have the same kind of history or ecosystem of disability justice movement that say the west coast has. And so there are different needs. There were a lot of organizations that we were looking at and working with, that they're doing the work, but the infrastructure support and the technical assistance and understanding of the hoops that you have to jump through for philanthropy, they weren't aware of.

Keedra Cheney:

And so there was a lot of trying to create that background information for organizations that were doing valuable on the ground work, but didn't necessarily have that backend understanding of the system and trying to help with on an on infrastructure level to help them get there.

Keedra Cheney:

And then on the other hand, you have organizations who are doing either disability rights work or doing work outside of disability justice, like work within the arts. And they didn't necessarily have the intersectional perspective that was needed or maybe disability rights organizations that are primarily white run, primarily run by folks who don't have disabilities. And so that perspective was the perspective of caregivers, as opposed to people with lived experience and understanding the gaps in that knowledge as well. And trying to be like, where can capacity and understanding be built on that level was something that we talked a lot about with that particular group. Thanks.

Emily Ladell:

Keidra, thank you so much. I know that there is so much to unpack here in regard to a lot of the lessons learned and the dynamics at play when it comes to participatory grant making and Katie, I would love if you could share some of your insights on this as well.

Katie Murphy:

Sure. One of the first lessons that I've had is that it's a lot easier to do this kind of work when the executive director is from the community that you're serving. On the WITH Foundation, Ryan Easterly is a person with developmental disability, but he's the executive director. So when I get feedback from Ryan Easterly, that's like Katie, "We're trying to push the grantees in a specific way. So we need to provide them with a carrot. And you're just your feedback right now is a lot of sticks. So how can you develop as someone who's reviewing proposals in a way that you're actually pushing the conversation forward?"

Katie Murphy:

And that would feel very different, or I would have to question a lot of the development that I'm getting from Ryan and from WITH if it was coming from a nondisabled person, because you always have that question in the back of your mind, is this ableism? Is this a manifestation of societal prejudice?

Katie Murphy:

And it's a lot easier when you don't have to wonder that just by yourself because it can be a stressful moment, even with people you believe have the best of intentions because we all do things that we're not entirely conscious of. So that's really great. And it also provides mentorship within your own community. And I realize that's a pretty high bar for a lot of organizations. They're like, "Oh, change your executive director to somebody else."

Katie Murphy:

But that actually really has helped. Another thing that I've learned is that you really have to be wary of tokenism. When you look at the structure of the WITH self advocate advisory committee, people are brought on by application. People are brought on by applying on the WITH website. We do an interview with them as members of the committee. And we see if they're a good fit, if they'll have the time commitment, if they have the knowledge base, if they're willing to grow.

Katie Murphy:

And then we will add them to the committee. WITH ability central. They have a very sort of strange model because it's an organization that focuses on communication, they want a stakeholder from each of these subgroups that they've identified. They want someone with a cognitive disability.

Katie Murphy:

They want someone who's deaf. They want someone who's part of hearing. They want someone who's blind. And what ends up happening is that you end up just having sort of this rogue gallery of tokens and nobody has anybody that they can count on to back them up.

Katie Murphy:

Because one, we don't know each other. We don't run in the same sort of circles. And it becomes very easy when you're searching out for people with sort of a hyper focus on their identity to be looking for people just to tick a box, rather than looking for someone who is going to grow with your organization and help your organization grow. So those are my big takeaways, is that you really structurally have to be concerned about tokenism, about the dynamics within the group, whether you are dividing people who should not be divided, whether it's going to be a pleasant experience for them to be on a board. And then the second thing is actually looking at your leadership structure. How does your leadership structure make the people who are... members of the community who are participating, how does it make them feel? How does it pose additional challenges to them?

Emily Ladell:

Katie, thank you so much for all of that incredibly powerful food for thought. And Kerry, I would like to turn it over to you and then we will shift into our next question.

Carrie Thompson:

Great. Thank you, Emily. Thank you, Katie, and Keidra, all of these are just really important takeaways to keep emphasizing. And for Disability Advice Fund, I think for some of the takeaways that I would have to say, in addition to what others have already said is to understand that it is okay to keep evolving your model for the participatory grant making because even if we can all agree on what it means to be a participatory grant maker, what it looks like can be slightly different.

Carrie Thompson:

And DRF have evolved over the time we've started with the Global Advisory Panel. We have shifted over to increasing which groups was the one to hold the key to decisions. And I'm sorry, my guide dog is nudging me a little bit and I should do a little video description of my guide dog if he does pop on the video. It's an adorable black lab retriever and he's not quite sure he understands why I'm speaking and no one is in the room.

Carrie Thompson:

So he thinks I'm speaking to him. Good boy, sit down, sit down. Okay. So sorry to get off track with that. So a key takeaway is to understand, to always keep looking at your model, to see what works, to see what you need to change. And the other really important takeaway has really been looking at power dynamic and as an international organization, we really had to make sure that the region that we were funding were well representative. So we needed to make sure that we had someone from Asia, someone from Africa, someone from the Pacific island countries and someone from the Caribbean where we fund, sitting on the grant making committee or on the board of directors. And you can also understand why this is so important when you can look at regional differences as both Keidra and Katie has already talked about within the United States.

Carrie Thompson:

I'm a person who is from Louisiana and spent half my life in Louisiana and half my life in Massachusetts, completely opposite social and political culture. And the disability vice issue that I have in Louisiana are different from the disability vice issues I have in Massachusetts. So it was so key to make sure that there is regional representation. The other take away is to make sure that we really understand the power dynamic. So for Disability Rights Fund, our grant making committee does consist of some donor representatives in addition to the activist with disabilities. In the early days, sometimes it seems like the donor representatives spoke more, whereas the persons with disabilities spoke less. And we wanted to shift that narrative to make sure that we amplify the expertise of the activists with disabilities. We also saw a power dynamic between men with disabilities and women with disabilities.

Carrie Thompson:

That was another area that we really needed to understand, to create a gender balance on the representation of the committee members. And that is also what sort of drove us to creating a gender guideline strategy. And we recently launched an implementation plan for the gender guideline that you can find on Disability Rights Fund website, under strategic plans. Another area that we saw that there was a power dynamic is internally within the disability rights movement, that there are a lot of disabilities. There are many different disabilities and there's such a wide spectrum. And a lot of those activists with disabilities who have had an opportunity to take the lead or be part of the bigger national organization, come from those with physical disabilities, those with visual impairment, and sometimes those that are deaf. But there are a whole other category of disability that have typically been marginalized and excluded even by other members of the disability rights movement.

Carrie Thompson:

And DRF has defined what we mean by marginalized members in the disability community. We include those to be youth with disabilities, women with disabilities, indigenous persons with disability, LGBTQI persons with disability, persons with psychosocial disability, persons with intellectual disabilities, little person, persons with deaf blindness, such as myself. It was really key that there was a gender balance on our committees, that there was also representation of the various marginalized members. And one other key takeaway was how important it was to understand how different the views from the city versus the rural community. The DRF has positioned are funding to focus around the grass roots, the emergent organization, and marginalized organization. So thank you, back to you Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you, Kerry. And we all just touched on so much about lived experience, power dynamics, the diversity that exists within the disability community. There are so many questions that I think come to mind when people who work for funding organizations are considering how we can start out with participatory grant making. And so I would love if as we wrap up our conversation, we can talk a little bit about what grant making organizations can do to actively engage with and connect with people who have lived experience. How can they take the initiative? And I think this points to a bigger question, which is in regard to the current landscape of philanthropy, and more specifically in regard to the concept of participatory grant making, have we seen progress and where do we still need to move forward? So where are we now and what can philanthropy actively do to move forward? And again, Keidra, I would love to start with you on this question.

Keedra Cheney:

Thanks Emily. I think one of the things that philanthropy can do is to Kerry's point acknowledge the diversity of disability. I think that there's an idea of disability embodying a certain type of person, and it's usually around physical disabilities and it's frankly, usually white people. The intersection between disability and other identities is not often acknowledged. And in many cases, there are already disabled people living and working in fields across the philanthropy community and nonprofit community and activism spectrum. And when disability and ableism is a conversation that can be had more openly and people can either choose to self-identify as disabled and talk about their disability within just broader conversations about philanthropy, then it becomes easier to find those people who are disabled, who want to be a part of that broader conversation about grant making. And I think just normalizing disability, chronic illness, as the regular part of the lived experiences of everyone, it isn't something that is happening to a small percentage of people over there.

Keedra Cheney:

And it's also not something... there aren't just disabled people in organizations that are ready for prime time. I think there's a lot of folks who are representing and doing amazing work in disability justice, who are in a lot of smaller grassroots organizations that aren't necessarily being seen by philanthropic organizations. They're smaller collectives, they're individuals who are doing mutual aid work. It embodies a lot of different work that isn't just 501C3s and that work is important and often overlooked. So I think really looking at the diversity, of not just what disability is, but how disability justice is being practiced, I think is a step in the right direction. But it also involves a lot of self-reflection and looking at complacency and looking at how ableism shows up in the hiring processes of most nonprofits and most philanthropic organizations.

Keedra Cheney:

It's a lot of confronting personal bias and even internalized ableism where people who don't necessarily think of themselves as disabled because that's what other people are even if you actually are, creating work places that disabled people aren't just showing... they're not just hired as a token disabled person, but they can become leaders and thrive and grow. And that takes more than just the hiring itself, that takes really confronting and interrogating the very structure of the organization and the field. And that involves humility as well. And looking at where barriers have been placed that keep a lot of people out or may keep people within your community from actually leading and thriving and speaking up against ableism before disabled people are ready. So I think self-reflection and really looking to disabled people to basically come correct, to tell folks when they need to come correct and taking that advice and working with it is really one of the first steps that [inaudible]. Thanks Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Keidra, thank you so, so much for all of that insight and Katie, I'd like to turn it over to you for your insight as well.

Katie Murphy:

I think in terms of recruiting people to serve on participatory grant making communities, to get people from the community involved, it's really important not to be reaching out to organizations that are not controlled by the community. I see a lot of organizations, grantees saying, "We're going to find self advocates by reaching out to the Special Olympics." And that just keeps happening and happening. I'm well one, you're drawing a very sort of strange pool of self advocates. That's a hobbyist organization. It's just because it's running around outside and doing athletics things, it doesn't make it any less niche that you are looking specifically for athletes with developmental disabilities to advise on your projects. And the Special Olympics is not controlled by disabled people. So really you have to contact organizations and also just networkers who have disabilities, are held by communities with disabilities.

Katie Murphy:

And that's how I got involved. I was recruited through the autistic self-advocacy network. And then from there I was recruited from WITH, to ability central. And it's a much more, I think, reliable source of people who will disagree with you, which I think is the most important type of person that you can get on a community participatory grant making committee, is someone who will vehemently disagree with you, who doesn't care about how you feel about them and who honestly can get angry at you. And I think that's another sort of untapped pool of people, is the people you know of who are off at you. Not you personally, don't get your high school bully to join your committee, but if there are community members who are critiquing your organization, if there are community members who are standing up and posting online saying what you're doing is completely off base, then those are the people you should be confronting and saying, "Hey, would you like money to yell at us because you're doing it for free, so would you like to join this structured organization?"

Katie Murphy:

And the pay thing is also really important. We talk about providing economic access and providing a sense of value to the work that community members are doing. So there needs to be a line item for compensating people who are doing this type of work, people who are advising your organization, people who are deciding on what grants are being funded. And the biggest advice I can give is just go for people who make you uncomfortable, go for organizations that make you defensive, because they're still going to be making remarks about your organization. You might as well be benefiting from it.
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Katie Murphy:

Your organization, you might as well be benefiting from it.

Emily Ladell:

Katie, thank you so much and Kerry, I'd like to wrap up with you on this question and then we will move into the Q&A portion.

Carrie Thompson:

Thank you, Emily. This is Kerry. I wanted to ask if you could repeat the question. I got distracted by the guide dog when you asked the question. Is it about what our recommendation is for recruiting?

Emily Ladell:

Essentially, yes. I would love to hear both your insights on how grant making organizations can directly connect with community members and find people with lived experience. Beyond that, to address a little bit more broadly, where we are in the current philanthropic space in terms of successes with participatory grant making, but also where we need to go, the progress that we need to make.

Carrie Thompson:

Okay. Thank you. So 10 questions. I will start with trying to... what I would say is one thing for grant making organizations, before you recruit, you need to actually think about what your scope of work is. What is the role of your grant making committee members? You'd be surprised how often people jump right into recruiting and think it's all about getting people with disabilities or members of the communities to come to the table. You really have to treat this like it is a job, a job description that outlined what the expectations are, the time commitment that is involved so people understand what they are getting involved with. So they can be honest and forthright about their ability to give the time and attention that it takes. It is not simply showing up for a meeting. There are many materials to review ahead of time.

Carrie Thompson:

How many times a year does your meeting meet? Then when you're ready to start recruiting, the way DRF does is that we have started with a nomination process. We reach out to organizations of persons with disabilities, specifically membership organizations of persons with disabilities to help spread the word that DRF is looking for new members for the disability advice fund grant making committee. And we do sometimes look, and I know it sounds like we're trying to box in specific types of disabilities or specific types, which maybe sounds like counterintuitive, but I think it is important for us to keep looking at the composition of our current grant making committee. Who do we have representing so far? Do we have a gender balance? Do we have a regional balance? Do we have someone representing those with youth? Do we have somebody representing indigenous person? Do we have a representation from marginalized member? We can't check off every single box, but we certainly aim to do so.

Carrie Thompson:

It is also really important to understand that you could try defining term limit. So DRF terms are four years and after four years we look into new nominations and it's so key that the nomination and the spread of words is coming through organizations of persons with disabilities and not donors. This person would be a great person to be on the grant making committee. We drive this process through organizations of persons with disabilities.

Carrie Thompson:

In terms of what I see in progress and in terms of where I see things in philanthropy now I agree with what Keidra and Katie have already expressed. I sometimes do see... I am definitely seeing more curiosity around participatory grant making, which is fantastic to see.

Carrie Thompson:

I sometimes see some organization doing what I kind of call posturing, where they want to show they have an advisory committee that they have people with disabilities on their grant making committee, but it just seems like they really have not given an opportunity for these members to give valuable input, to share their expertise and the most important of all be part of the decision making process. But I do see progress and going back to the early days of DRF I saw a number of donor representatives who were not persons with disabilities, and didn't always have staff with disabilities, but over the year, I am so pleased to see the shift where many of the donor representatives that come to the committee are persons with disabilities. I have seen an increased number of persons with disabilities on various philanthropy organizations, which is really fantastic to see, because I think it truly deepens and enriches their understanding of disability rights and trying to build connection with other movements such as the Women's Rights movement and Indigenous Rights movement, the LGBTQ community and the Black Lives movement.

Carrie Thompson:

I see progress in terms of more interest in funding disability rights but I also see, as we're taking a step forward, there's also a step backwards and there's already such a small percentage of funding that goes towards disability rights. Overall, I believe the numbers are 2% of funding from foundations go to disability rights and 3% of bilateral funds go towards disability rights. And yet, as small as those numbers sound, it almost sounds like they're starting to decrease. It could be contributed to the pandemic. In some ways, some funders have increased their funding support of disability rights because of the pandemic and the barrier the pandemic presented. On the other hand, some foundations and bilateral have to make cuts because of the pandemic and sometimes disability rights is one of the first areas where they make cuts. So it's so important to keep being mindful that no matter what is happening in the world, what crisis is happening in the world, disability rights still needs to be a key part of fund making. Pardon me, grant making and keeping this in the mind of philanthropy moving forward.

Carrie Thompson:

Now, hopefully I answered as many questions as possible.

Emily Ladell:

Kerry, thank you. I know that there was quite a lot that I was throwing at you in the hopes that we could fit in as much of everyone's wisdom as possible.

Emily Ladell:

We are nearing the end of the hour, but we did get a question that is incredibly powerful. I'm hoping we can answer it almost as a sort of lightning round, where if you could each just take a minute to give your insight I would really love to hear how does participatory grant making account for the fact that there are often so many members of a community who just don't have the time or the energy to advocate for themselves, but are still in critical need of support. This was a question we got from Nico who joined us today, and I think it's really worth exploring.

Emily Ladell:

Hi Nico. Thank you so much.

Emily Ladell:

So if you could all just give a brief insight, I would really, really appreciate that and we'll go in our usual order. So Keidra, let's start with you.

Keedra Cheney:

I have some thoughts about this. Pay people. You got to pay folks. Pay folks for their time, pay folks for their insight, and more than just the $150 and/or some pizza. Because that tends to be the "We need to hear from the community here, have some dominoes", way of trying to get insight from people. But also I think just the way that these kind of meetings and collaborations are structured are filled with a lot of barriers. People don't necessarily have the time or they can't afford to take a half day to go to a meeting that's going to last all day. They need more breaks than are often allowed in a lot of these intensive zoom meetings. A lot of people, especially now can't and won't and should not fly. So trying to do a bunch of onsite stuff for folks who are immunocompromised or who have a lot of access needs, or that are definitely not going to be met in this moment.

Keedra Cheney:

Don't ask people to travel. Make the effort to find as many ways to incorporate people safely as possible. A lot of the barriers are structural because it's assumed that it's an able bodied professional person that has the ability to just take an afternoon off for this work. Was what I was alluding to before. As a professional, I can go to my job and say, "Hey, give me... can I have a half an hour or half a day off so that I can be a part of this meeting", and it's fine, but for somebody else, a half a day or a day, that's a big chunk of their paycheck. So in addition to giving money, understanding that the time isn't necessarily there to give and understand how to create asynchronous opportunities for people to participate, which means, sorry, you might have to do some stuff after work because that's the only time you can reach the people who can do... they're busy doing the underground work, they have full-time jobs.

Keedra Cheney:

And so you have to inconvenience yourself in order to make it more possible for diverse people from different backgrounds to be able to participate. So flexibility, creativity, thinking outside of the box and thinking about people. The barriers that a lot of people face are not what we in this community necessarily have to deal with because of class privilege in access to work. So just really understanding how to be flexible to the point of being maybe uncomfortable and taking on some of the barriers yourself in order to create more opportunity for other people to be involved.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so, so much Keidra, and we are getting down a bit to the wire. So Katie and Kerry, I will just ask if either of you have anything very quickly that you would like to add to the conversation.

Katie Murphy:

I would say, this is Katie. I would say that in addition to the pay that you should be giving the people who are participating, you also, the organizations should be covering childcare and dependent costs because it ends up... you end up paying people say $500, and then someone who has dependent care responsibilities that gets eaten up and they made no money and no sense. I would say cover dependent care costs and any other cost associated with their participation.

Carrie Thompson:

This is Kerry speaking. I would also echo that flexibility is really key and checking in with new grant making committee members about an upcoming meeting and letting them know what is coming up. We definitely understand that it's so important to understand that people are giving their time and definitely should be compensated for their time. We also want to make sure that they're given a reasonable amount of time. The pandemic has really helped to make us evolve how we meet. That's the key takeaway. Going back to that, you have to keep evolving your processes and checking in with new members to see where things are with all the members. We decided not to do any in person meeting this year, because it was just not really possible for the majority of our committee members to travel all around the world, to come to Boston or any other location and switched over to virtual meetings once again. And that was the preference for the majority of our members. Back to you Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so, so much everyone. And we are just at the top of the hour. I am going to turn it back over to Emily Harris, who is going to wrap us up from the panel portion and move us into the more casual conversation portion for anyone who'd like to stick around to join us.

Emily Harris:

Thank you so much. Emily, Keidra, Kerry, and Katie. What an amazing conversation. I hope that you will stay and come on camera and as Emily said, have a casual conversation or continue to put your questions in the chat. For those of you leaving now, please help us learn about your experience by taking a few minutes to fill out a survey and please come back early and often to our other series. You can find them on disabilityphilanthropy.org. Also consider, if your organization wants to take action, encouraging your leadership to sign the disability inclusion pledge. We hope to see you not only in October, but on June 16th, when our next public webinar on disability, arts, and culture will come forward. So now I want to turn things back quickly to our wonderful panel and continue this conversation. Again, feel free if you're comfortable coming on camera and off mute and/or please continue to use the chat. Thank you all.

Emily Ladell:

Hi everyone. If you are still with us, we welcome you to drop questions in the chat, to come on to the camera or turn on your microphone, to chime in. We are here to continue to engage in conversation. Hi Niko. Did you want to add something to the conversation?

Niko:

Well, I just learned so much today, so I'm not sure what else to ask right at this second, but I'm hanging out.

Emily Ladell:

Wonderful. Wonderful. Thank you so much for your very insightful question.

Emily Ladell:

I see we have a question from Jen Bokoff in the chat and I'd love to share that with everyone. I will post the question and then we can do what we've been usually doing, where we'll have Keidra, Katie and then Kerry answering.

Emily Ladell:

What strategies do you use for regular reflection and iteration on your participatory grant making models? How do you hold space for what's working and also for what's not working? That's a great question.

Emily Ladell:

Keidra.

Keedra Cheney:

That's an excellent question. Sorry I was just thinking about how to answer that.

Keedra Cheney:

One of the things that we did is... there was a points' system. We had a lot of time to look at every grant and were able to... there was a scoring rubric that was based around the different elements of how we would give funding: participation, intersectionality, radical inclusion, leadership of those with disabilities and cross movement solidarity, and really took the time to flag questions or concerns, or if we needed a little bit more information or background on the organization, on the makeup of the organization, like participation of folks with disabilities. And we would get back to the Borealis staff with those questions before our next meeting. And they would do a lot of due diligence to be able to get that dialogue going.

Keedra Cheney:

Really trying to look at the long view for many of the organizations that they were coming back for more funding and getting a feel of the history and where they sit in terms of the work that they do within their community and with other organizations. But we had a parking lot where if there were any questions of who needed a deeper dive or an ongoing kind of dialogue

Emily Ladell:

Keidra can I just ask you to pause for one moment, because captioning seems to not be working. Sorry. No, don't apologize at all. I just wanted to pause because I want to make sure everybody has access not to cut you off.

Keedra Cheney:

No Problem.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so much. Kathleen, it seems like captioning is not working in zoom.

Kathleen:

Sure. Yes. So our Captioners, Christine and Kathleen feel free to come off of mute and let us know if we need to refresh anything. Thank you so much.

Christine:

We have Christine... the transcript that we can still view through that... post it once again, and just as... my apologies about that.

Kathleen:

Okay. Christine and Kathleen, let us know when the zoom captioning has resumed and then we'll also put the direct link to the external captions.

Christine:

Testing.

Christine:

Close captioning will appear here. Full stop. Currently confirm if you were able to see captions full stop.

Kathleen:

I can see them external. Can we have someone check internal to zoom?

Carrie Thompson:

It's Kerry. I'm on the external part. It's going.

Kathleen:

Okay. Okay, perfect. So we're okay in zoom.

Captioner Kathleen:

Emily... Mac speaking Mac, are we okay on zoom Mac?

Kathleen:

Let's see. So it says we have

Captioner Kathleen:

[inaudible]

Kathleen:

Oh and Captioner Kathleen we can still hear you.

Captioner Kathleen:

Captioner Kathleen. Oh, I'm sorry you guys.

Kathleen:

That's okay. No worries.

Kathleen:

Okay. It feels like it's not working in zoom. Okay. Jen, I see your note that you'll use the external link. We'll continue to work on that as we go along.I'll be in communication with the captures to see what that looks like.

Emily Harris:

Something happening on zoom right now. This is Emily

Emily Ladell:

It looks like we are back on zoom.

Kathleen:

Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you everyone. And thank you Keidra for taking that pause with us while we got captions back up. If there is anything else that you wanted to add to what you were saying because I know I cut you off mid sentence. I'm so sorry.

Keedra Cheney:

Oh no, no worries. I think where I had left off is that we had a parking lot's segment of our notes. That was our space to really get more information to interrogate, to really... If there were ongoing questions or discussions that we wanted to have, we would have a space in every meeting that was a parking lot space where we could discuss any kind of ongoing questions that we had and ask them of each other, but also ask them of Borealis staff to then go to the grantee, the applicant, and to start a dialogue to get a little bit more information. So it really was very two way and it gave us an opportunity to learn more about the applicants while also talking with each other about what our perspective was about the grantee and the process of the organization and how they were set up. It was really two way and iterative.

Emily Ladell:

Keidra, thank you so, so much again for your insights and for bearing with us on that. Katie, I'd like to turn it over to you and again, just as a reminder because we got a little bumpy, the question is, how do you hold space for what's working and what's not working when it comes to participatory grant making?

Katie Murphy:

I'm coming out this from two different positions. One as an elected leader for an advisory committee and another as just a member of an advisory committee. And as you know, a leader chosen by the people, I think the seven of us to...
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Katie Murphy:

... I think the seven of us to represent the interests of the group. I try to model as much as possible a process for giving feedback live of telling the WITH Foundation what is and isn't working. So it can be really small structural things about how we do the meetings. If we're going to talk about grant proposals from the previous cycle, let's make sure we have the time to put the summaries of those proposals in the chat so that people can refresh their memories, because it's been four months and we've just reviewed a whole other slate of grant proposals, so we're not thinking about four months ago.

Katie Murphy:

It's really modeling and making it so people are less inhibited about speaking up about what they need or what they think would be best for the group in terms of operations. Because I realize as a white person, a lot of educational privilege, I have a lot of institutional privilege, not just as someone who has a title within the group, but also as someone whose background affords them a lot of confidence in saying, "I don't think this is right and here's why. Here's my analytical reasoning for it." So I try to model that and make it easier for the next person to speak up. That does not work so well in Ability Central, where I don't have an elected position. When I do speak out, I just don't get listened to. Case in point, the name of the organization. It used to have a great name, which was the Disability Communications Fund. You knew what it was doing, it was funding things. You knew it was about disability and you knew it was about communications. They decided to rename the organization Ability Central, which sounds... I don't even know what type of work an organization called Ability Central would do. Is it job placement? What is it? I was really the lone person who was like, "Hey, this is taking the word disability out. It's ableist. This is a really vague title." But again, because I was the only voice speaking up about it, because of the dynamics of that organization, of the committee, it just got lost in the wind. I was just one cantankerous person.

Katie Murphy:

So that strategy that may work well on one committee may not work for another organization. And you really, as organizations, have to make sure that one lone voices are listened to, and make it so that there isn't just one lone voice. That people are able to actually form coalitions within the committee, that they're able to find points of agreement, rather than the points of agreement only being with the talking points of the organization. So I try to model things as much as possible, but at the end of the day, there really are institutional dynamics that prevent people from talking and prevent people from speaking out.

Emily Ladell:

I absolutely hear you on that. Kerry, I'd love to know how you hold space for what's working and what's not.

Carrie Thompson:

That's an excellent question. This is Kerry speaking. What we do at the end of our grant making committee meeting is we always ask people to reflect on the entire process. How they received the grant making material, how they received the grant recommendation, what they thought at the template. It's always evolving. There have been some years when committee members have asked for more, and there have been other times when committee members have asked for less. So we've been tweaking that process based on the feedback from the committee members. That's really important to keep staying in touch with everyone about their individual need. You can't assume that you understand the disability, and therefore, can understand what they may need. I've made that mistake sometimes myself in trying to assume that I, as a person with a disability, might understand what another person with a disability might need.

Carrie Thompson:

One example is that I created simplified language version of our grant making material. One individual whom I was making it for said, "This is helpful, but I would like it with pictures." Because I was only using simple language. And I thought, okay, pictures. Now I can certainly see how this was helpful. Then when I incorporated Easyread versions that included simple language as well as images, not only did this help one individual, many other members of the grant making committee really appreciated this condensed summary, and choose four pages or so of all this vast material that was covered in each individual recommendation.

Carrie Thompson:

So it's important to really understand that you need to constantly modify what you provide, and it's always based on feedback. So making sure that there's a space for feedback, not just in the meeting, but to give ample opportunities to continue to provide feedback or suggestions in email or one on one conversation. And understanding that you really want to let the committee members know that they are the ones that drive what the needs are. They tell us what they need, what they want, and we do our best to address those. So that is how we try to really help make this process easier, more manageable, less time consuming.

Carrie Thompson:

I think originally, the question seemed like it was really about how do we reflect? DRF has received a grant from [inaudible] foundation a few years ago to really be a case study on participatory grant making. They interviewed staff members, they interviewed grantees, they interviewed committee members current and past, they interviewed former global advisory panel members. It was really, really insightful to read this report and see what people said works well, what didn't work so well, what we need to keep doing better. That is just always just trying to have a monitoring and evaluating component to new approaches to participatory grant making.

Carrie Thompson:

I'm sure people want to learn more and more about participatory grant making. I just want to note that there is a community out there, the participatory grant makers community, and I believe the website is participatorygrantmaking.org. So that's another resource that people can go check out to learn more. Back to you, Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you all so much. We have another question that has come in from Joanna. A fantastic question. I think it's very much related to a lot of what we've already been talking about in terms of creating access for a variety of different types of disabilities and access needs. So how do you ensure that it's not just people with educational privilege, who are the people who are coming forward to be part of the participatory grant making process? I think that's an excellent question. I would love to know if you have any thoughts. Keidra, I can turn it to you.

Keedra Cheney:

That's another excellent question. I think a little bit of what I had mentioned earlier about that some of the work that is being done in this space isn't being done at 501(c)(3)s. I think a lot about on social media right now, there's so many young, marginalized, non-professional, professional educated activists who are actively doing this work right now who don't align themselves with organizations necessarily. They're doing a lot of extremely grassroots ad hoc work. And there's just so much insight and wisdom and on the ground work that's being done in virtual and digital spaces that I think often gets overlooked in more formal non-profit and philanthropic areas. Those are the leaders. There's a lot of young leaders right now who aren't seen as being a part of this movement or this space that can be drawn into this. They have perspectives that none of us are thinking about right now, and are really doing some amazing work.

Keedra Cheney:

So I think taking seriously and watching and responding to a lot of the "non-traditional," and I say that with air quotes because it's not... Just because it's non-traditional doesn't mean it's not valid, but it's work that's being done outside of formal non-profit spaces. Much of it is digital and it is in online communities and they are doing leadership. I think that identifying and respecting those perspectives and voices can go a long way in bridging that gap.

Keedra Cheney:

But there's also a lot of bias. I think there's a bias if you speak a certain way, if you present yourself in a particular way, that people say, "Well, this person is 'articulate,'" again with the air quotes, " because they look and sound and present themselves in a way that is appeasing to philanthropic and non-profit spaces." The ready for prime time look, as I called it before. A lot of the leaders that are doing really important work aren't necessarily going to be in these meetings. So it does take research. It does take reaching out in spaces that a lot of people may not be comfortable in, and reaching out to allies and folks that are doing the work who have connections with community based grassroots, non-501(c)(3) digital space groups that are really doing that work.

Keedra Cheney:

It takes, as I said before, nimbleness, flexibility, creativity, and looking at where personal bias comes in, because I think that's a big part of it. People don't see the people doing the work because the people who are doing the work don't have the look that they're used to or talk in the way that they're used to or use the same lingo and language. And so the assumption that they don't use the same lingo and language means they don't understand, but they do. It's just not what philanthropy and non-profit spaces are used to in terms of being articulate or understanding of nuance. And so really interrogating that personal bias for who you listen to and who you see as a leader and who you see as valuable and the insights that come from that is a lot of that tricky work, but it's a big part of it. Thanks.

Emily Ladell:

Thank you so, so much. I also want to invite a response from Katie and then a response from Kerry, and then we will be-

Katie Murphy:

I want to echo what-

Emily Ladell:

Oh, I was just going to say, I think we'll be wrapping up after that.

Katie Murphy:

I want to echo what Keidra is saying. It's so important to be looking into online and digital spaces. It's really become a space of connection and an informal network of mutual aid for disabled people, especially disabled people who are autistic, disabled people who are geographically isolated in many ways.

Katie Murphy:

I think this is an area in which really, there can be an integration between your foundation's social media team and your recruitment team for getting more self-advocates, getting more disabled people involved. It's being able to identify the spaces where these conversations are happening and realizing that more and more, these conversations are not happening in public forum. They're going into places like Discord. They're going back to the way it was maybe 20 years ago where these are private forums. So you really have to do more research and you have to have more understanding of the community to be able to do outreach into what I would call maybe free floating activists.

Katie Murphy:

I'm not someone who has a job in a non-profit. So for a lot of organizations that are recruiting just from their former grantees, I would never be someone who would come up because I have a job in a completely different industry. I have to realize as well, the amount of institutional privilege I have, that I was able to get connected into this network of developmental disability funders. So I think you really have to be looking very, very hard.

Katie Murphy:

Another source that I think is really untapped is arts organizations. I think in the non-profit world, sometimes unless you are actually focusing on the arts, there's a bit of a more social sciencey bias, right? They're not contacting groups like Sins Invalid, they're not contacting disabled artists, because they have a real, real connection to the activist community. So that's one place where you can work locally, is finding artists, finding creative groups, and seeing who they know. Many times, it's a deeper connection into the community that's geographically specific to you, if that's important to you. But the biggest, biggest, biggest playground is online, 100%, especially if you're trying to get autistic people involved. So just echoing what Keidra is saying, you got to get more competent and you have to be more focused in your recruitment through online channels.

Emily Ladell:

And finally, Kerry, if you could close us out. And then we're just about at the end of our time together already.

Carrie Thompson:

Thank you, Emily. This is Kerry speaking. I guess one thing for an international organization is when you're working in some countries, you also have to be really mindful that not everyone has internet access and access to electricity, or understanding how expensive that internet access can be. So that is something DF tried to be really mindful of when we're doing outreach, and really trying to work with grantees and members at the disability community to overcome those different obstacles.

Carrie Thompson:

But one initial thought that I was really thinking about is that there is an action of youth with disabilities being given opportunity to take the lead. I often see in the disability rights movement that it is an older generation that have taken the lead, and not everyone tries to mentor a future generation of leaders with disabilities. I think that is going to be so critical, and a call to action that I put out there for disability rights organization and disability rights leaders now, to think about how can you foster a new generation of leaders with disabilities? How can you give them opportunity to take the lead? How can you make sure that they're being included in this work? How will you be mentoring youths with disabilities? And also, I think it's important that more of these leadership and fellowship opportunity on a broader scale are also trying to outreach youth with disabilities. So many time, leadership opportunity don't even bother to reach out to those with disabilities, and that's really key. Many places, it's the expertise and the experience that we value over having a college degree. That is a key for organizations to think about, of not just thinking about inside the box or thinking of looking for those that are the most exposed, the highly visible leaders. Look for the ones that are invisible, that have not had an opportunity to speak.

Carrie Thompson:

Thank you so much. I just wanted to thank everyone so much for this. I wanted to just sign the phrase, "nothing about us without us," because it's so powerful to see, and not just hear verbally, but to understand the abstract of it. So this is how we sign it. Nothing about us without us. Over to you, Emily.

Emily Ladell:

Kerry, I cannot think of a more powerful ending. I want to thank everyone so, so much all of you, Keidra, Katie, and Kerry for your generosity of spirit and time today in joining us. I want to thank everyone who joined us in the audience and who asked such thoughtful question. I want to remind you all one more time that we have a survey link that will be dropped in the chat. If you could just let us know your thoughts on today's event, that would be so great. And also, if you're not already, please follow us on social media. I am dropping those links in the chat. We will wrap up from here. Thank you so much, everyone. Have a wonderful day.

Keedra Cheney:

Thank you.

Carrie Thompson:

Thank you.

Katie Murphy:

Thank you.
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