TRANSCRIPT

"BOOK LAUNCH—INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PATHWAYS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE"

A conversation with Joan Dassin, Amini Kajunju, Robin Marsh, and Dilafruz Nazarova

Recorded March 5, 2018

ANNOUNCER:

You are listening to a recording of the Open Society Foundations, working to build vibrant and tolerant democracies worldwide. Visit at OpenSocietyFoundations.org.

MARTHA LOERKE:

I wanna say a special thanks to the people who came from out of town, including one of our panelists-- Robin and Joan and as well, even-- Dilafruz as well. So I also wanna note that-- Joan's gonna contextualize why this book-- exists and why we're here a little bit.

But just to say that-- there are-- chapter authors up here and there are chapter authors out there-- including-- Zoe Brogdin (PH) standing in the back there, who also is one of the chapter authors as well as being the primary mover and shaker of this event. So if you're gonna shake someone's hand, make sure it's Zoe's. Frederico and Yaland (PH), also authors. And is-- I don't see Mirka-- oh, she is, sorry, Mirka. That's me not with my glasses on. (OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

MARTHA LOERKE:

Yeah, I already said. So thank you other authors for also joining us and-- helping to sort of push this conversation along. Yeah, I think otherwise-- originally, I was gonna try to capture the range of other representation here, but it kind of seems like most of you maybe have some (LAUGH) idea of that already.

But just to note that we are grateful for other foundations joining us. We are grateful for other general higher education expertise joining us and we're grateful for anybody, frankly, who finds this interesting and is-- is somewhat involved in this-- what we're trying to take a look (NOISE) at here. But that-- I will turn it over to Joan and then come back for the-- the heart of it.

JOAN DASSIN:

Thank you very much, Martha. And I'd like to start off by thanking Martha and Zoe and the Open Society Foundations for hosting us in this lovely space-- and for all of you for-- for coming. This is beginning to feel as if we really do have a community of research and practice around scholarships.

Those of us who have worked in this field know this-- but it's nice to see-- familiar faces and also new people who are joining this conversation. Martha asked me to help contextualize the book. Why did-- why did we do this?

Clearly, it was a labor of love and we like to be with our friends, that's-- that was one reason. But, more seriously, the-- the idea for the book, as we recount in the-- introductory chapter-- came up-- when we had a little side meeting at a NAFSA convention in 2015 in Boston, now my home city.

And it-- occurred to us that we'd been having these kinds of side meetings with other scholarship practitioners at the margins of-- international and higher education meetings for many, many years. But there was no-- book-- solid piece of work that we could point to that began to bring together-- the knowledge, research, information, continuing questions that we had about the art and practice of international scholarships.

And so, rather than having a newsletter or continuing to promise to be in touch and then-- apologize for why we weren't at the next meeting, we decided that we would actually-- build-- a book. And I think what was most important about this is it's a conversation-- this book is a conversation about-- international education and international topics, but it's conducted across national lines, it's conducted by international people.

So it wasn't just-- a few views, it was a multi-perspective view of what, in fact, is a multi-faceted problem. So the first reason for-- working on this book and-- and trying to-- create as much of a holistic view of this field is precisely because it is very fragmented. We looked into many-- studies, found out that-- at least on inventory chronicled-- scholarship programs in 200 countries.

The-- there was no systematic categorization, very difficult to even get your hands around what we mean when we're talking about scholarships. And if you couldn't do that, it would be very difficult to-- to have a field where you could go beyond just trading tips and actually do serious research.

So our first impulse-- and this is clearly just the beginning, not-- not the end, there are other books out there, of course-- was to try to address this question of a fragmented landscape. And we did that in the organization of the book by having a number of cross-cutting themes that always resurface, individual versus institutional support, and particularly the focus on the relationship of scholarships to social change. That was our big-- driving-- force.

So the-- the data are still very incomplete. The-- field is very disperse, but our first motivation was to bring together as much as we could to start creating, delineating the borders of a field. So that was-- motivation number one. Motivation number two that I think is very important and still ongoing is the reemergence of higher education on the development agenda.

For years, the orthodoxy-- promulgated by the world bank and many development organizations, was that the major investment had to be in primary education. And while that wasn't a bad thing, it also coincided, particularly in the 1980s, with a major disinvestment in higher education. So you saw-- the collapse of many-- for example-- flagship public universities in Africa.

So as a result-- over the last ten to 15 years, maybe even 20 years now, there's more attention paid to higher education as a means to spur international development, investment in human capital. And since scholarships are a very important part of why individuals are able to attain the kind of mobility they need to access higher education, that gave the whole framework-- more urgency than had been true in previous years.

And the final reason is that-- I suppose you could refer to a boomlet (?)-- a little boom in research-- and evaluation studies in particular. We have Mirka and Rajaka (PH) from IIE. The institute, of course, has spent many years doing evaluation research and trying to build methodologies that actually, not only measure impact, but begin to assess it in a more substantive way.

So those were factors. The landscape was fragmented, we wanted to at least try to bring some coherence. There's more emphasis now on-- higher education as-- instrumental-- to development, and there has been, in the last ten to 15 years, more research than had been done previously.

And so those were the factors that led us to say, "Well, now it's a timely moment to try to pull this together as much as we can and not only-- try to summarize the state of the art, but to lay out what a future agenda of both research and practice would look like."

MARTHA LOERKE:

Fabulous. And well-timed. (LAUGHTER) Others, take note. (LAUGH) So we've set this up to be kind of-- an interview situation. I have specific questions for each of my colleagues up here and we'll sort of go through each one. And-- the colleague at the very end-- represents a specific perspective, 'cause she's one of our alum-- from one of our scholarship programs.

So she is here to definitively tell us, you know, what we've done right or wrong. But I'm gonna start-- and I'll just do some-- what I hope will be tantalizing descriptions of the chapters that we represent-- but I'm not gonna do a full description of each one, and then ask the questions.

And I'm starting off with my friend here, Robin Marsh. And Robin, if you don't her already, is-- Robin is a socioeconomist with over 25 years of development practice and research experience. And she's currently, luckily for her I think-- a senior-- researcher at the Institute for the Study of Societal Issues at Berkley-- and, as well, one of the co-editors of this volume-- as well as a co-author of the chapter we're about to discuss with Dr. Ruth Wifo Oyalare (PH)-- from Morehouse College, who is unfortunately not with us here.
The chapter that they did was called "Global Migration Of Talent, Drain, Gain, And Transnational Impacts." And a lot of what the chapter is digging is-- I think what is fairly extensive research and data that is trying to track, I suppose, the-- what we could call the professional migratory patterns-- of international scholarship-- recipients.

And I think what-- what came out to me and-- among other things, was that the-- the data that's out there does challenge, if not-- or sort of augment traditional assumptions about what return means. What is the-- incentivizing-- what are the best ways to incentivize scholarship-- recipients to return to their home country and provide a sort of professional benefit, a profit benefit-- back to the home country.

And so there's this sense that, previously, everyone talks about brain drain because if you're in a country that has predominantly centralized, financed-- higher education and you've made an investment in these individuals and they leave and they don't come back then you have a loss.

So I-- what-- what struck me was that when you start to talk about terms that I think are still getting a little bit of-- further-- sort of interrogation within our-- within our new field here-- brain gain, brain circulation. First thing that comes to mind, of course, is brain circulation that-- kind of reminds us that technology has to be part of our conversation.
And-- the idea that-- that knowledge transfer can happen almost instantaneously now-- and that really does have to be in your brain if you're thinking about then why do we international scholarship programs if you can hit a few buttons-- theoretically, I would say, right?

I wanna just flag a couple of your stats, because I do think it's helpful to contextualize this entire conversation, because it was good for me to learn, anyway, that international students represent only 2% of tertiary enrollment-- globally. Most tertiary education is happening locally. Of those who travel in that 2%, most are self-financed. So when we're talking about sponsored scholarships we're talking about a very specific subset, which Joan reminded me is, nevertheless, a very strategic investment-- in those.

But I think that any interrogation of the issue of return and impact needs to recognize that we are dealing with kind of a small sample in some ways. My questions, however-- so you mention that sponsored study abroads, so scholarships, tends to have better return rates than

self-finance. And I just wanna know why. Why might that be so, what-- you know, what does that come from?

ROBIN MARSH:

Hi, everybody. Thanks for coming. I'm from California, so this seems like a cold day, but it's probably just sort of medium for you guys. Yes, and that-- data comes not only-- from the literature review that we did for this book from-- but from my-- original research on African alumni from-- different North American universities-- that I did, sponsored by the MasterCard Foundation Scholars Program.

It's quite striking that the return rates for-- scholar-- international scholarship recipients of those that are sponsored either by government or by private foundations are much higher than those that are self-financed. Self-financed (THROAT CLEARING) either by their families, which is typical, or even if the universities are chipping in for part of-- to pay their fees.

Those rates of return are much lower. And I think it's somewhat self-evident, but I guess it's worth-- going over the various reasons. The first is conditionality that-- those that come on government scholarships, or even private foundations-- there is often, if not a requirement and-- and a conditionality that they return and the visa reflects that-- it's not a requirement, an expectation, because-- often they are interested in the multiplier that this-- this-- young person will return with skills and knowledge and-- and ways of thinking and doing that will spread beyond themselves.

And so there has to be return for that to happen. I mean, that's-- so-- so these students-- come with the idea that they're going to-- to return, very different than when they're privately financed and the-- it's up to them. You know, that-- there's-- they-- they're-- they have-- free range as to what they do when they graduate.

And so they're looking almost exclusively at-- maybe the economic returns or other factors. And-- a couple other things, and this is more recently-- but some of the scholarship programs work on making it a softer reintegration or reentry when they finish by providing-- certain incentives post-graduation incentives, like-- small grants of involved in alumni-- involvement in alumni networks.

They may even, while they're studying, sponsor-- internships back home so that they are developing networks and expertise, meaning that a job is more likely to be waiting for them-- when they-- so they're investing in the scholar to be prepared to move back home as well as the expectations and conditionality.

And the only other thing that I would say that even furthers this is if the home conditions are somewhat positive for the return. So-- the home conditions are economically and politically somewhat stable, somewhat dynamic, then all of these, you know, conditions-- converge.

If the situation back home is negative-- economically or politically, strikingly negative, there may be people that break those conditionality bonds and-- and don't return. But overall, the data is-- striking difference between the two groups, yeah.

MARTHA LOERKE:

That is a relief, because we do a lot of-- program work in designing those enhancements and incentives (LAUGH) to return and it's nice to know that there is data out there that makes it-- justifiable. So the data and the reports that you've described in the chapter really seem pretty robust in terms of-- supporting the notion of brain circulation--

ROBIN MARSH:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

MARTHA LOERKE:

--as opposed to brain drain. Nevertheless, you give a couple little tantalizing other things that-- make me-- you talk about Collier's (PH) work that suggests that there are also social and political impacts from foreign-trained nationals and households with migrants.

You as well-- bring forward two really interesting examples of when you're talking about incentives to return from programs in Mexico and Colombia that remind us-- again, that there's also the question of intellectual return. So these references to social, political impact, in-- intellectual return, what I wanna know is do those-- do those examples-- do they also engage with brain circulation?

Because brain circulation is-- from what I was reading in your chapter, is a lot about talent and expertise. And that can sort of flow along different international patterns. But sort of intellectual-- engagement back into home country universities and political and social impact, it might change what that household does. I think you reference voting patterns, if I'm not mistaken.

ROBIN MARSH:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM), uh-huh (AFFIRM).

MARTHA LOERKE:

That doesn't happen along those, you know, technology-facilitated communication patterns. So does talent circulation-- include or suggest a value circulation, in your view, that might lead to what we could start to quantify as positive social change?

ROBIN MARSH:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM). That was a long question. (LAUGHTER) I'm gonna take bits and pieces of it. She cites-- you know, Colliers did a great-- job with his book *Exodus*, which I recommend for any of you who has-- haven't read it and looks at-- all the patterns of migration-- and the winners and losers in that.

And there were a couple of studies that showed, even among the diaspora of populations that don't return home, they can be influential in the political viewpoints, even the voting patterns and the social activism back home because of this constant communication now between diaspora communities and their families.

So in-- I think it was in three countries, Cape Verde, Senegal, and Mexico, there aren't a whole lot of studies that show this, but they did show that say Mexicans in the United States are influencing the way their family votes in Mexico. The Senegalese are influencing the way-- they're-- they're literally having conversations over the phone and trying to transmit values and new ideas and perspectives that maybe they're getting from other sources of media that people don't even-- I would say that's happening.

I wouldn't say that's very huge. I think the main issue that you're pointing to is that brain circulation in the entrepreneurial field-- and even in-- some scientific and technology realms, can work very well because you can have joint ventures, you can have knowledge networks, you can have collaborative research.

And, you-- you know, where you have labs maybe in two different countries, but they really are-- communicating well and you have scientists that work virtually very effectively and entrepreneurs back home in the (UNINTEL) country that-- that benefit greatly from the ex-pat communities or the diaspora communities that are sending them new ideas and investment capital and so and so forth.

These things work well and that's brain circulation and we wouldn't wanna stop that or curtail. I-- I think what you're pointing to is the kind of brain drain-- which is truly a drain, it's a loss for the sending countries when their more innovative citizens leave permanently and where the home country is lacking that human capital is-- for building institutions, for the kind of long-term investment in institutional change that you've got to be there.

You've got to be going through those passes, you've gotta be going-- you've getting be gaining a certain reputation, a certain-- stature that then leads to leadership and you can't really-- we know that people who have been in the United States for a very long time, or Europe, and then, you know, they return home-- now to be leaders in their country, it may or not work because they haven't, as they said-- you know, paid their dues.

So that kind of-- some of the social and political work that we all need the long-term commitment for I would say requires physical return and there is a real brain drain. This is not-- an obsolete term. And the-- the countries that are facing this most are smaller countries

that don't have the dynamism to attract returnees in the same way that in India or Singapore or China would or-- or Chile or Colombia and Mexico and Brazil, all of which have really good return programs-- you know, return incentive programs. So the countries, in some sense, that we're most worried about are experiencing brain drain. Did that get at some of it?

MARTHA LOERKE:

I think so.

JOAN DASSIN:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM). (LAUGHTER) Could I make a comment?

MARTHA LOERKE:

You may.

JOAN DASSIN:

Right-- you know, I think-- Robin's chapter is very important because the-- brain drain debate rages on among the economists and they get really caught up in rather arcane debates about the-- whether the-- the net-- value of-- remittances is actually greater than the forfeited income on taxes if people were to return and so forth.

That's what the literature focuses on. But the implications of this work for scholarships really drive at the heart, but so many of the designs and the practical decisions about scholarships focus not on the scholarship itself, (LAUGH) but on the post-study return. And-- we-- I think the value of the chapter is to make us-- rethink the automatic assumption that physical return is what we mean by return.

And perhaps the more-- catholic, with a small C, way to think of this is that there are multiple returns on this kind of investment. And the trajectories may diverge. And that's a very radical shift in the way in which the traditional arc of a scholarship is envisioned. And it comes right down to what kinds of requirements and conditionalities are put on the individual. So this is very important to be thinking about this whole question of return in the broader context of global labor markets, for example.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Okay. In a way, that's a good segue into talking, perhaps, a little bit more specifically about Africa, which is so frequently sort of painted as a diaspora-- you know, deep diaspora country. So we've-- we're very lucky that Amini -- Kajunju? Sorry--

AMINI KAJUNU:

It's okay. (LAUGH)

MARTHA LOERKE:

--is here to join. Five years ago, *Forbes Magazine* named Amini as one of the 20 young power women-- in Africa. And she has certainly-- I'm not gonna arm wrestle, but I think that-- (LAUGHTER) her CV alone far outweighs mine, I think. But the-- I think she's really proved them right in that-- sort of tapping-- your potentials in what you're going to do. You currently are directing the strategic partnerships at Africa Integras, is that still--

AMINI KAJUNU:

No.

MARTHA LOERKE:

--ok. That-- that part is-- I knew African American Institute was done, but that--

AMINI KAJUNU:

So I'm not the executive director of the IUGB Foundation --

MARTHA LOERKE:

Yeah.

AMINI KAJUNU:

There we go. I'm now the executive director of the IUGB Foundation--

MARTHA LOERKE:

Okay.

AMINI KAJUNU:

--International University-- of Grand-Bassam, which is the 30 minutes out of—Coite d'Ivoire – outside of Abidjan and Coite d'Ivoire.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Excellent. (LAUGH) And still, I hope-- so I just thought I'd get some of this correct-- contributing to the Universe of South Africa, the-- the--

AMINI KAJUNU:

I'm-- I'm-- I'm on the advisory board.

MARTHA LOERKE:

--the-- advisory board and world economic forum, Economics of Innovation Council, and the non-profit Angel Africa. I wanna list them as much as possible so that we get the full range of-- (LAUGH) what we can then expect from you in our answer, right? (LAUGH) So your chapter was "International Scholarships in the Ecosystem of Higher Education in Africa."

And I think Amini took an interesting-- sort of different tact than some of the other chapters because she went out and interviewed people. She did three solid interviews with some pretty powerful individuals and-- good thinkers, obviously. Paul Saleza (PH)--

AMINI KAJUNU:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

MARTHA LOERKE:

--Vice Chancellor of the United States International University Africa, Todai Kinina (PH)--

AMINI KAJUNU:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

MARTHA LOERKE:

--executive director of the Partnership for African Social and Governance Research, and Patrick Owaja (PH)--

AMINI KAJUNU:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

MARTHA LOERKE:

--who, of course, is the founder and president of Ashesi University in Ghana.

AMINI KAJUNU:

Yeah.

MARTHA LOERKE:

And I wanted-- one thing that I wanted to flag at the outset of talking about Africa is that, for me anyway, what used to be, "Oh, well that's an Africa problem-- is no longer the case."

AMINI KAJUNU:

Unh-uh (NEGATIVE).

MARTHA LOERKE:

So much of the challenges that are coming out in that-- context are true in so many places. I mean, it-- it goes without saying, obviously, the demographics, you know, youth bulge of the population, the lack of capacity of local institutions of higher education to absorb that-- that sort of massive demand on higher education, the sort of-- lackadaisical attitude of governments in a lot of countries-- towards being-- towards putting a priority on higher education.

This is all coming forward in-- in various ways from the interviews that you shared-- but it just struck as reading it is that this is-- you know, we could be saying this about the Middle East, we could be talking about Southeast Asia, and it's just kind of-- I wanted to raise that so that we understand that when you give us solutions, that they can be applied-- perhaps beyond Africa as well.

But the thing that I really jumped on in your chapter was-- that you just briefly referenced that, in describing the Africa history of support scholarships, you mentioned that it started well before international aid, agencies, and donors showed up with community-led and funded support to students.

And for-- I also have-- an OSF colleague here, who sort of echoed this and said that the history of social change in Africa is a history marked by associational or group-led initiatives. And-- I really wanna know a lot more about that (LAUGH) because it links into what we're gonna talk about with Joan, but-- so that's the first question is simply, can you give us a little bit more on that particular history of association-- associational-- impacts on social change?

ROBIN MARSH:

Yeah. Thank you, thank you everyone for coming. That's something that-- Todai, who was formerly at-- Carnegie, really emphasized with me. He-- he-- he wanted to-- share with me, and therefore share with the readers of the chapters, that-- when-- when African countries started becoming independent, there was such a hunger for nation-building.

And then that led to understanding that part of nation-building is capacity-building, in-- you know, human capacity-building. And-- and-- and so-- you know, despite the fact that, now when many-- when people think of African countries, we do think of a disinvestment in higher education. But-- but there was a time when investing in higher education was a strong priority. And-- and it happened at all levels.

It started at the community level. It went on to, you know, the-- the-- the government sphere. Governments spent a lot of money on-- on higher education, on education in general, but on higher education. There was an understanding that this was going to be a critical element to building the economic and political infrastructure of many African countries. At the community level-- there was this-- this-- and it still happens today, but I think it was even-- deeper then. You know, you identified people in the community who you thought could really take off and then you invested a lot of money and time and effort into them.

And the idea was that they would go off and get that education and come back and-- and change the community that they were from. And-- and-- and those models were-- were-- were there by the time the Americans, you know, (LAUGH) came in, whether through government or through foundations, like Ford and Rockefeller, et cetera. That-- that-- it-- it was already there--

MARTHA LOERKE:

Yeah.

AMINI KAJUNU:

--and-- and Todai was really-- really wanted to emphasize that. And also, before the Americans, there were other countries that were part of this. So for example, my father benefited from a scholarships from the country of Japan. Japan came to Kinshasa-- I'm originally from the DRC, and went to then Lovanium University, now the University of Kinshasa, and looked for the best students and provided them with a scholarship.
My father happened to be one of them and he was given a scholarship at Osaka University. And-- and, you know, the-- you know, the condition to come back was very clear. So we went to Japan, we came back. And, you know-- my father came back into society and gave back to-- you know, the society that he grew up in.

But other countries were a part of it. And you can also-- I remember that, during the Cold War, the Russians were a big part of this as well. Yeah-- and, you know, there's a Patrice Lumumba University in-- in Moscow. So all of that kind of tells you that even before the Americans were sort of a big part of this-- there were countries, there were communities, local and-- and-- obviously the governments also were very involved in-- in higher education.

MARTHA LOERKE:

I'm glad this is being recorded, 'cause I didn't write that all down, but I do wanna remember it. So secondly, you also-- flagged that it's important to give-- possibly to-- to the benefits of giving scholarship support to African institutions to give out themselves and that strengthens the institution obviously, as well as the scholarships'-- beneficiaries.

But you do highlight the key-- problem or possible challenge here. And I-- I'll quote it, because I think this is also true around the world, that the key to attracting more scholarship funds for students is a university's commitment to academic excellence.

And what I wanna know from what you know is do you see divergent expectations of what academic excellent is within the continent or internationally and if so, what should non-African donors and program designers in particular understand in order to keep international scholarship programs responsive to African needs?

AMINI KAJUNU:

(LAUGH) We could talk about that all day. Yeah, I think-- I think-- the influx of resources into-- African universities for scholarships is-- is critical conversation. And-- a couple of things. So one, many African university-- may-- may not be-- not-- well, may not be aware-- or even if they're aware, they may not know how best to attract foreign money in a way that-- is-- is-- is sustainable and in a way that is-- you know, that is beneficial to the students and beneficial to the institutions.

And, you know-- donors-- so-- I feel like African universities, like American universities-- American universities have a really good knowledge of how to deal with donors. And it's been built over decades and decades and decades of-- American universities being-- such powerhouses when it comes to fundraising.

It's not the case in other parts of the world, it's a very American thing to do. And I think if-- if American universities want to have part of that, of those resources, we have to, you know, speak the language of the donors, we have to understand what makes us stand out. One of the things that Patrick-- that I mention in book, that Patrick-- from Ashesi University-- talks about is, you know-- many African universities want to be all things to all students.

And he's thinking about, "Could we-- could we start thinking about specializing-- universities specializing in certain topics and certain subjects?" And it becomes a center of excellent for a key set of-- degrees and then other-- universities, you know, take on other subjects because they have competitive advantage in those subjects for one reason or another. And-- and that could be a way to attract-- dollars but also to increased academic excellent-- because you-- you're not trying to be all things to all people and-- and you can really specialize in-- in certain subjects and really be good at them and offer them in a 21st century way.

But of course, that's easier said than done. I mean, the-- this-- I think of University of Ghana, for example. It's trying to educate 38,000 students. Kenyatta University is trying to educate about 72,000 students. So, I mean, the-- the need to-- democratize higher education is so great.

And at the same time, we need academic excellent in order to attract dollars, real dollars. So that-- that-- tug of war is-- is complicated to solve. But it-- it needs to be solved because-- a lot of the public institutions don't have enough resources to provide the kind of education that they want to provide to their students.

And the academic excellent conversation becomes very difficult to have because these-- these schools are saying, "Well, we're doing the best that we can with the money that we have. But yet, they're not, in some ways, really preparing their students for a 21st century world." It's-- it's-- it's complicated conversation. (LAUGH)

MARTHA LOERKE:

It reminds me that-- one of our other alum, who also sits on our advisory board-- has talked to me about donor distortion. And I guess part of the question here-- or part of the hope is that the centers of excellence, as they develop in Africa, aren't defining themselves by donors terms, right, and are-- yeah, did you wanna--

AMINI KAJUNU:

Yeah, the-- well, you know, all of us who've-- we've managed non-profits and have fundraised, you know, the challenges, you know, do you chase the money? Do you say to a donor, "Oh, that's what you give money to? Guess what, that's what I'm doing now." You know? (LAUGHTER) Or-- oh, you like cats? You know, we love cats too. (LAUGHTER)

You know-- or-- or do you say, you know, "This is who we are, this is who we've determined-- this is what we've determined to be the need and this is how we-- we believe we can-- we can provide a solution to this need." And then you go out and look for likeminded donors. It's-- it's hard.

You know, it's-- it's really hard. And-- and many-- many African universities are looking to the United States and its philanthropic-- world and seeing if they can take a piece of it. And-- and I think that's important. You know, I think it's very important. Obviously, you know, where I am at IUGB, that's exactly what we're trying to do. We're trying to bring-- all that is great about the United States and its resources to IUGB. And so that's-- it's a very important part of our work. But-- I think-- you know, I think we-- you know, we need a two pronged solution. We need solutions from the United States, great, that's fine.

But we also need local solutions. And I'll just say this, you know, one thing. And we can talk about it even so more. But, you know, how does philanthropy look like in Africa? We are philanthropic people, but we typically do it through families and communities, we don't do it through institutions.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

AMINI KAJUNU:

It's not-- it's not very often that a wealthy African is going to write a check to a institution that he or she cares about. Do we need to change that because our needs are so great on the education front, on the social front?

Do we-- do we need to have the Don Gotes (PH) of the world write a check to an institution, an educational institution that they care about so that they can see a certain kind of education happening? Maybe, because we can't rely only on American philanthropists and we can't rely on governments all the time. And so what about the private sector? What role do they play in this?

MARTHA LOERKE:

That is exactly what I wanted to know. So Robin wanted to jump in for two seconds.

ROBIN MARSH:

Just two seconds. Just to-- point out that Patrick Owaja, who was one of the three who were interviewed-- that Amini interviewed for her chapter, is someone who is an international scholarship recipient and went to Swarthmore and then he went to UC Berkeley and he decided that the best way to apply everything that he had learned in the United States was to start this small-- which now is a very, very successful private university in Ghana.

So that's another way in which it's not donor-driven, but some of that American knowledge and influence and networking-- which you were talking about why Patrick is so successful at fundraising, it comes through through their alumni, who were international scholars. So it's

pertinent for our discussion here. Just wanted to point that out. And also a UC Berkeley alum. (LAUGHTER)

MARTHA LOERKE:

And if I'm not mistaken, he had at least ten years at Microsoft with-- which also helps. (LAUGHTER) So-- and he's a brilliant guy, which really helps. So Joan, the-- we're-- I think we're not gonna bring other people into a conversation that you and I have a lot, right? So-- but let me-- again, for those of you, and it's unlikely, who don't know Joan Dassin, she is currently a professor of international education and development as well as director of the Sustainable International Development Program at the Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis, where we are very, very happy to have probably 600,000 of our grantees go through there. (LAUGH) Maybe slightly less.

JOAN DASSIN:

Send more.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Yeah, right. (LAUGH) But also importantly for this conversation, she spent at least 13 years leading the Ford Foundation's International Fellowship program and as well important for this conversation is that you have three Fulbright awards-- under your belt. So I feel like you represent, not only the teaching research of a university, the program design administrator, but also the scholarships recipient perspective.

I'm only gonna ask about a couple of these. So-- (LAUGH) so Joan did a great chapter with Daveed Navret (PH)-- who is a research professor at the Center For Research In Advanced Studies And Social Anthropology in Mexico. And their chapter was on "International Scholarships and Social Change, Elements for a New Approach."

And I think this is really gonna be something that I hope that-- continues in conversations after the panel, because the-- the chapter really captures essential strengths and weaknesses of a range of evaluation methods that are already out there that we all see by-- various agencies over the past decade or so.

A recurring message in my reading of this chapter is that there's a problem that we-- mea culpa-- of relying on self-reporting-- by scholarship beneficiaries. And I'd never really thought about that, 'cause our knee-jerk reaction is you wanna know something, do a survey. But this-- self-reporting dependence kind of bypasses any other indicators that might be out there, pos-- positive social change that are extrinsic to any one individual's experience. So we all kind of suffer from the absence-- of control groups-- Mirka, you're nodding? (LAUGHTER)

And the-- the concomitant-- difficulties in establishing causality-- whether-- an individual scholarship really does produce what we think it does. As Joan-- as they put it so well in the chapter, if social justice products are simply counted and not contextualized, then what is it that we're really learning about whether or not social change has happened?

So the proposal, therefore, (SINGS) duh duh duh duh, is-- to shift the assessment viewpoint, which I think is fantastic. In the-- in their words, it's deconstructing the global vision of social impact and developing evaluation strategies based on a view of scholarship holders as social rather than individual actors. Hence, the importance of what Amini was telling us, I think about the community-led support and the-- history of-- of social change in Africa.

This is-- for those of you-- who haven't thoroughly committed this book to memory yet, this also is reflected a little bit in I guess what a more traditional sociological-- constructs that Matt Mower (PH) talks about in his chapter and those are micro, meso, and macro approach to evaluation. So what I wanna know is (LAUGH) what would this look like, where would you start? Is there a theory of change out there that would be helpful, or is this, again, kind of exciting-- the beginning of a new framework? That's the first question. (LAUGHTER)

JOAN DASSIN:

Okay, great, thank you Martha. And I-- I wanna invite Mirka to have a word about this also, because her chapter in the book is very much about what is the appropriate perspective? How do you begin to even conceptualize this problem, much less solve it?

So what's the problem? And-- you know, I've struggled with this for probably decades. (LAUGH) I don't have a clear-- answer yet. The-- the central paradox of scholarships and measuring their social impacts is that you give a scholarship to an individual, and yet, you're looking for some kind of social change, which implies either an institution, other individuals, a community, something larger than the individual.

So that's a paradox. We focus all our efforts in scholarship programs on individuals. And increasingly, we recognize the power of networks. So there's a lot of funding for-- networking events, the-- electronic communications and platforms make this a lot easier. But we had-- we have to be able to get from here to there. You know, get from the individual recipient to some broader impact. So for my coauthor Daveed and I, this was the central problem of the book, which is called-- Individual-- *International Scholarships In High Education, Pathways To Social Change*. So our first problem was-- we had to link these two.

How do we get from the individual to the social change, whatever that might be? So conceptually, that was really the first breakthrough and Robin should get a lot of credit for this and our other coeditor as well. We conceptualized a number of different pathways, that's a metaphor, but it works-- to help you to traverse this distance between the individual recipient, meaning when I was a full-- Fulbright scholar, and the change, positive we hope, that this individual will catalyze, will incentivize, will help create, right?

So some of the pathways that come out are this individual change agent and that turns out to be the very-- the kind of-- where most of the evaluations end, okay? You know, Senor X will get his-- scholarship, study in the fount of knowledge in a Western university, go home, and, you know, become the minister of-- finance-- at-- at which point, he will no longer support scholarships, right? (LAUGHTER)

But he will become the minister of finance and therefore-- make change. So the-- but however, we were also able to conceptualize other pathways, the networking pathway, and what our Ford-- scholarship program-- focused on so heavily, which was using the program itself as an instrument of social change to widen access to higher education.

And in a way, that was easier to measure, because we could-- look at the impact-- we could look at the-- what the program was actually accomplishing by-- providing scholarships to people from marginalized communities, others who were excluded from higher education-- and so on. So that was the first conceptual problem that we tried to solve was how do you get from here to there?

How do you try to resolve this paradox of an individual investment creating social returns, okay? And just a few more comments about that-- what we did in terms of the research in the chapter, which turned out to be very interesting, was we called it deconstructing a global vision because there's this kind of stylized narrative, the finance minister narrative. You see this instead tracer (?) studies over and over and over again.

The successful students, who usually-- appear in a little cameo where they tell their story, nobody ever says, "Let me tell you about the ways I've failed, let me tell you about the two years that I spent on the job market." You know, we highlight success. But interestingly enough, that narrative, that trajectory is-- repeated, not only at the global level, but at the regional level. So Daveed looked into evaluations of-- (FOREIGN LANGUAGE) the big Mexican scholarship program, which has been going for decades and a large program from Chile.

And he found the same exact narrative-- focusing on the individual, the individual's achievements, the individual's ultimate high position, usually in government, and that was the end of the story. So we said, "Well, the very first thing we have to do is try to get past this stylization and recognize that all these different individuals are gonna have different journeys.

And that those journeys are gonna have different-- points of insertion in institutions and so on." And so what that tells us then is that-- and this is kind of international-- development 101, context is everything. So there was one other-- so we don't contextualize these studies enough and that's because they often rely on surveys-- which can only get at the qualitative-- quantitative dimension and are-- even then, are reduced to a very small number of respondents usually.

So not enough people are doing field research. And I have to say, the IIE study-- tracking study is doing field research. And that's really important. So there's one more story I wanna

tell you that helped us to be thinking about how we were gonna deconstruct this stylized narrative. So Daveed in the chapter takes the story of two IFP fellows, both from indigenous communities-- with similar economic-- socioeconomic profiles.

They both-- one studied in-- somewhere in-- they both studied in Latin America. Very similar, slightly different fields, but (COUGH) concerned with social justice. And if you were just writing that story from 30,000 feet, you would say-- you would look at the successful outcomes. But, it turned out that-- poor Saol (PH) had a very different outcome then-- his successful colleague Alberto (PH), who did very well. One student prospered in the post-scholarship life, the other failed. And so that led us to believe that, you know, you really had to drill down to see what kinds of impacts people were having.

And what that ultimately meant, and I'll conclude with this, is our-- our proposal is to-- change the narrative from an individual story to a collective story, to be thinking about individuals represent groups. They're women, they're indigenous people, they live in rural areas.

And to look at their scholarship trajectory, not only in terms of where they land at the end, but where have they come from and what is that trajectory about? And that is a very different perspective than you typically find in this literature. And I would just say one final, final comment, which is we noticed also when we were doing the research, there are very few people from so called-- sending countries that do this research.

I was-- we have very few-- scholars from developing countries who are actually looking at what is going on in their own countries. And that seems like something that we can fix by making sure that there are more global scholars that are part of this conversation.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Since you anticipated my second question, the benefits of showing up at 3:00 p.m. this afternoon-- (LAUGH) (BACKGROUND VOICE) you don't get a second question then. (LAUGHTER) My eye is also somewhat on the clock here and I wanna jump now-- down the table to Dilafruz. Dilafruz Nazarova is-- what we-- her website says, "An accomplished human rights lawyer," so behave everyone-- from Tajikistan, who is currently working on a doctorate at the political science department at Rutgers.

In addition to doing that and being that, she's also the director of development for the U.N. and Global Policy Study's MA program and teaches international law, civil rights, civil liberties, and human rights. She's done some time working for the Tajik government, but also places like the International Committee for Red Cross, Penal Reform International, Rule of Law Initiative With The American-- Bar Association, and the British Institute for War and Peace Reporting.

Most importantly, she is an OSF scholarship alum. She was a beneficiary of our-- our doctoral fellowship program, which, sadly, no longer exists. But nevertheless, while it did, it

was managed and cared for by Zoe Brogdin, again-- back there. So Dilafruz, you have to lay it out. Be-- be blunt, be honest, be real, and tell us what did we get right, what did we miss?

DILAFRUZ NAZAROVA:

Hello, everyone. It's an honor to be here. But at the same time, it's a big task to represent a huge pool of scholars, fellows, and alumni. But I'll try my best. So the-- Ph.D. program doesn't exist anymore, but I do exist-- (LAUGHTER) so-- let's see.

I loved the book. And-- I said to-- I said to authors-- before we came here that I don't get to read this kind of-- literature very often. All I read is about political science and-- with my children about KPop now. (LAUGHTER) So they-- we are into that. And this was-- a very interesting read.

And when I also-- you know-- went through a couple of chapters-- I was also thinking that, "Hmm, I know a lot of this, but I never really thought about those things until I hear or I read that someone else actually vocalize it." And it was-- it was very interesting. You know, the number one thought I had from this book and there were a lot of good things, obviously, that I can relate to. But-- to me, number one thing probably was-- a part where you discuss what is next and-- yeah, that's a big-- question.

And perhaps that a big question for me, especially now as I'm-- you know, at that stage. So I'm here in America now, but tomorrow I probably go home and-- you know, have to face the reality. Because when we have a scholarship-- we are kind of protected, we are taken care of, and believe in a dream for a couple of months, for two years when we do our masters or for six years when we do our Ph.D. But once that is over, we have to be thrown back to reality, which is very often-- is quite uncertain-- not for everybody though.

But-- you know, for many of us, it's quite uncertain. And when I think about, you know, what is next for me, I know that if I have-- if I travel back home to tomorrow, the next day I'll find a job, definitely. So I won't sit doing nothing and wondering what is next there. But, would that be a job that's-- you know, I know that I'm prepared or I-- I was hoping to get? So that is-- a really big question.

And-- how to-- so what are the issues there and why is it so-- difficult-- even to think about it? There are several things, I think is-- for one thing, is what-- you call in the book a labor integration problem. So when we-- return and when we have to prove again ourselves there-- so we have to prove ourselves here, that we can handle that Ph.D. program in political science that I never thought I'll do.

But-- now we have to go back and again, prove ourselves to our government that we are worth offering a, you know, good job there with-- prospectives. Or-- you know-- non-governmental sector that we possess in expertise and knowledge that you can use. And to people as well. You know, because it's not only about labor integration, it's also about cultural reintegration-- back-- home.

So-- and-- one of the issues that I thought might help with that a little bit is-- if, you know, those providing scholarship work a little bit harder maybe. Of course, not-- this doesn't apply to everybody, you know, or all-- all scholarships. But to some-- work a little bit better with the governments on-- on the issue of how our foreign degree will (NOISE) translate into the national degree.

So would it be accepted there or not? Can we continue our research there or not? And what-- whatever we came up with, all those ideas and findings and outcomes will be accepted there and used there? Because a lot of us, we do our research-- having in mind our countries. And my research is focused on my region and my country, definitely. And I had no other, even-- you know, any other thoughts about that. So I always wanted to do that because that's the context I know more. And-- that's the context I'm interested-- in most.

And-- an other thing is what you-- mentioned also was about physical return. And I absolutely understand the idea behind that and I agree that it's-- very important. But again, a lot of us, because of this-- problem of labor integration, et cetera-- so sometimes we feel that we can be made more useful, you know, working from-- far away from our countries. So as-- desk officers covering our region as-- people who are promoting information about our country and-- yeah, so I thought it's-- it's important, physical return is very important. But-- you know, taking into account that we can serve the same purposes from a distance is also something that-- that matters. And another thing I was-- very pleased to read in the book about is that-- a lot of scholarships, they don't abandon us -- fellows or scholars after everything is done. And Soros at OSF-- you know, proving that I'm here. (LAUGHTER) So that's the testament to that.

And-- yeah, so that is very important for, not only our reintegration back, but also for, you know-- giving us some other opportunities. If we cannot find something back home on our own, we still know that there is a support that can be provided.

And-- when I returned-- back home after I received my master degree-- from the U.K. and I basically got the same level job I had before my master degree. So it doesn't really make any difference and-- after a while, I said, "Okay, I am creating that and I am doing something else. Let me see what to do."

And I applied to OSF office there with a small grant and I receive that grant and I did a project, which I was very proud of, and it was useful, it was interesting, and I worked with the government, so it was impactful as well. So I got everything I-- I wanted to get. So I was very happy about that.

It-- and it also was a way for me to-- you know, get access to certain resources or certain people or avenues that I didn't have access to-- before so it was-- that-- that's a great way, I think, to-- to continue supporting-- alumni-- even if not through providing money, but at least through opening (LAUGH) those doors, so keeping those doors open at least-- so we can-- you know, continue and we have that-- time to-- to reintegrate back-- into our societies. Those were the main points I wanted to make about the book.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Thank you, thank you very much. And noted. (LAUGHTER)

DILAFRUZ NAZAROVA:

Okay.

MARTHA LOERKE:

On the point of-- alumni grants back in the home country. It's-- it's-- it's not easy. We've tried it and-- part of the problem is simply our own-- vulnerabilities-- as a staff being based in New York, how do assess and process-- grants? But now, knowing that you're-- here, perhaps we would help-- have you do it. (LAUGH) At least for some parts of the world.

My-- I-- I'm very curious-- and I wanna ask you and then probably throw it out for general-- mulling over and consumption, is this-- you know, we just toss around a lot of words, right? Phrases that-- there's a lot of assumed understanding here.

And one thing that I felt after rereading some of these over and over again-- how are we defining positive social change? And I wanna know, because now you've sat here in Rutgers in New Jersey in the United States, which is in a moment-- of a certain kind.

But you have a really strong, obviously, und-- deep understanding of what it's like to be in Tajikistan and what-- probably other parts of central Asia as well. What do you see-- do you see similar elements of how social change happens in both of those contexts? Or is it really completely different?

DILAFRUZ NAZAROVA:

I think there are-- you know, people live here and there, so-- and there are still, you know, ways-- same ways how you can impact people and their behavior and-- and-- try to change them or, you know, be-- you know, force-- encourage them to be more proactive-- starting from, you know, their own personal experiences and-- you know, going forward to the communities and-- bigger things.

So I think, with regard to social change, the approach is more or less similar in both contexts. And-- so, in terms of-- you know, how I, for example, as-- as a recipient or as an individual-- possibly contributing to positive social change there and here, to a certain extent, is there-- there-- there a few ways.

And-- for one thing is-- and I've faced it so many times-- (COUGH) so many times is that, for one thing, we are raising profiles of our countries, at least definitely in-- in the context of the former Soviet Union republics-- where I come from.

And-- so that's-- and it-- (COUGH) it works both ways, so it works both in Tajikistan, people are proud of me and my achievements there. So -- and (COUGH) people are proud here, you know, in my university or in my neighborhood-- when they know that, "Hmm, I'm an academia, hmm, I-- I (COUGH) come from that country and I have-- you know, all these experiences and I can talk about different things, about the American politics and international politics." And-- an other thing is-- a lot of programs and scholarships are aimed at-- (SIGH) bringing up leaders.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

DILAFRUZ NAZAROVA:

And a lot of us do succeed in that role-- here or back home. And-- but what I also was thinking is that even if we don't do it-- even if we are not offered the position of the-- at the ministry of-- of whatever-- or don't become parliamentarians-- so a lot of us serve as informal leaders in our communities.

You know, those who are not necessarily visible, but those who are respected and those who are-- you know-- approached-- all the time and-- it's-- it's-- interesting. So let me tell you-- my story, what I call my Kardashian moment. (LAUGHTER) Two years ago, in March-- one of the prominent-- media outlets in Tajikistan-- published an article about me.

And it-- the title was something-- "A Tajik girl now teaches in American university-- she's a professor at an American university," something like that. And-- it was a very well-known media outlet and they published it in print and in the media. So when I woke up in the morning, I had 200-- Facebook invites, friendship invites, et cetera. (LAUGHTER) So that was my moment-- at the time.

And-- and I received so many messages and e-mails and-- calls-- from people who were so proud about, you know-- of me and of my achievements and-- but the most important was that they were proud that I represent my country elsewhere. And this is how people in America see Tajiks, and especially Tajik women.

So it was very important for many people. I didn't thought about that-- before. So two years later-- so a couple of weeks ago-- I went to a wedding with my husband and it was a Tajik wedding, about 70 people. And when we were driving there-- I knew I knew not-- nobody there.

Seventy people invited and I-- I was sure that none of them are familiar. (LAUGH) But it appeared that everybody read that article (LAUGHTER) and saw my picture and remembered me and-- and they were approaching me and, again, with the same things that, "Oh, we were so proud.

I want my daughter to be like you. And so what would you advise or what do we do? Which university we go or," you know, all sorts of-- you know, those kind of issues. So I was an authority there, so they forgot about bridge and groom, so (LAUGHTER) I was a professor there.

So it was very interesting experience, which-- which-- which made me think that-- people are listening to us and people-- look up to us and-- it-- it matters for them. And of course, after that, I wrote countless letters of recommendations and read-- applications and so-- those kind of things.

But it's-- it's something that-- I really enjoy doing and I know that I know the stuff now and I can-- you know, contribute-- to that. Another thing, what-- the scholarships give us-- through our training and through our experience-- abroad especially, is that we are taught to see opportunities-- you know, somewhere where-- where others don't seem.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

DILAFRUZ NAZAROVA:

And-- we are more creative, we are more innovative, we are more-- open-minded, and we are more active, I think. And I noticed it-- especially when I go back home. And if I'm involved in any project, be it-- bigger or smaller, and when I come up with an idea, first reaction is-- "Uh-huh (AFFIRM). Are you kidding us?"

But then, you know, it takes a little bit convincing, but still, you know, people accept our ideas and they see that we are able to think out of the box-- very often. Another-- two more points I wanted to mention is that-- as it was written in the book at least-- you know, in the-- region of the former Soviet Union, a lot of scholarship is-- you know, started when-- after the collapse of the Soviet Union and early or late-- '90s and-- early 2000-- you know, in the beginning of this millennium, which is true.

And guess what? All those people grew up now and have children, which means that, you know, that investment that was, you know, inputted in us is actually, you know, multi-generational because, you know, all our children grew up with the same ideas-- with similar experiences.

My children were with me back in the U.K., they're here with me-- as well and they experience exactly the same-- you know, have the same experience as I have. So those scholarships, it's not only invested in-- in me, but in several other people at least-- in my family. And the final point I wanted to make is that because of my research, I looked at some literature about-- impact of-- financial aid and donors, et cetera, et cetera. And donors I usually, you know, criticized a lot for-- you know, investing money in certain projects.

And not taking necessarily taking into account local context and not-- generating that-- sense of ownership-- you know, at different levels. So usually, if it's a rule of law project, for example-- international organizations work with-- government, with the courts-- et cetera, et cetera. But then what happens is the public itself is not really educated and it's not supporting all those-- reforms because it doesn't understand those reforms, right? And there is -- instead of, you know, appreciating them and starting using them, they reject, they start resist-- all those reforms.

So I think educational scholarships address that gap very well but investing in-- a broad range of people. So it-- before, it was about elite, right, for scholarships, it started there. So now it is more diverse-- group of people that are covered by internship status, you know, preparing public for different changes, be political or social, cultural-- economic. And I think that's-- that's where the-- you know-- a right place for educational scholarship as-- donors-- to-- you know, to try-- to-- to force their-- that positive social change.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Wow. (LAUGHTER) Thank you, that-- that really ends us on-- on a good note. And at the same time, flags what we also don't capture, obviously. And evaluation is exactly the sort of more intangibles that come from being part of a family as well as part of a community and what you represent and-- and thank you very much for keeping us cognizant of that.

I am as well cognizant of the time and the fact that we only have, I think, the space more or less till 7:00, if I'm not correct. So I would like to propose-- I would like to give you an opp-- an option, basically. We can stay here and have questions come up to the microphone-- which helps for the recording-- process.

Or we can mill about and-- ask questions amongst ourselves. Or, alternatively, I feel it's probably a good idea to give everyone on the panel not only a round of applause, but as well an opportunity for any last statements. But-- but they would have to be super fast. (OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

MARTHA LOERKE:

Getting good advice from up here. So how about a couple of questions? And-- of course, be aware that you can-- no one's offended if you stand up and go get a glass of wine, bring two. (LAUGHTER) And-- and otherwise-- but let's-- yeah, let's open it up. Does anything spring to mind? Anybody else have different interpretations of positive social change? Susan Barrisford (PH), you probably do.

TANZIN GELLIG:

Okay, now it's on. Hi, my name Tanzin Gellig, (PH) I work for Trace Foundation. And-- I've been working with scholarships since-- '97. And a lot of the-- what you've written and the

comments really comes down what exactly most of us have faced for the scholarship. And so thank you so much.

And-- especially when you think about the social and the political impact, it really brings me to home in like-- we tried to really kind of demonstrate what we did, what we really impacted. And the discretion (PH) has been also mentioned by Susan as-- you know, an organization, you have to come up with this-- figures to say how much you benefited.

Like, what-- and so the comments that you bring is really, really very important and useful for me. So thank-- I wanted to say thank you. And I just have one comment rather than question. One of the impact that-- I felt, you know-- by many the scholarship organizations as well as ours, is creating scholarship programs around the world.

Because I've been talking to a number of organizations who did scholarship and treaty conversation and through our own experience, those people who receive scholarship either go back and talk about scholarships, somebody else pick up the idea, and found a scholarship program.

Or, the schools will deal-- for example, one of our fellows, when he returned, hired by the university and he talked about the scholarship that he received from us. The university created a scholarship, said, "Well, that's great idea, why-- why don't we do?"
And one-- another fellow, who went back and instead of a scholarship for Tibetan lawyers because he received a legal scholarship from us and is still running. And the (UNINTEL PHRASE) many impact. And if you listen, any scholarship program officers at organizations, as you mentioned, they have a connection with the scholarship program.

So I'm wondering, in the future, I think, that maybe revise this edition, if there is one, I think-- area of, like-- promoting scholarship, like-- or like everyone is promote-- promoting something, like a small-- gadget or the apps, like-- the smart phone apps.

They really spend a lot of time promoting this. But scholarship programs is such important and-- can have – a like -- you know, like a promotion of scholarship as a program of all. So through that, I think the impact maybe much bigger. So thank you so much.

MARTHA LOERKE:

I'm sure no one in this room will dissent-- (LAUGHTER) from that. Pat, I'm gonna back to the Kate, 'cause I know she's about to walk out the door. But Kate, can you come up? Do you-- do you mind? Kate Stimpson (PH).

KATE STIMPSON:

Well Martha, you've been wicked. (LAUGH)

MARTHA LOERKE:

I know, I'm vicious.

KATE STIMPSON:

The wicked Martha. (LAUGHTER) The very wicked Martha gave us the choice of asking questions or letting you all go have a drink. (LAUGHTER) So please forgive me, because I have a question-- or-- or a comment. And it's the Viktor Orban (PH) effect.

I mean, I love scholarships. I'm an enormous believer in international scholarships. I was a very happy Fulbright scholar, it changed my-- it transformed my life, as did working with you, Martha. But the Viktor Orban effect-- and in the United States, we have what I'm calling the Tom Cotton effect, who-- one of the most conservative members of the U.S. Senate with presidential ambitions, who was a Rhodes Scholar.

And so when I hear us talk about positive social change, I wonder if, perhaps, we're not dealing in the kind of self-congratulations in which I am a notable expert. (LAUGHTER) Or-- do we have to temper our rhetoric about positive social change? We have wonderful examples, at least according to my criteria.

But haunting me now is Viktor Orban and Tom Cotton? And I know there are others. So shall I continue with my naive optimism? Or do we have to have a more measured set of understandings about what happens and what is meant by positive social impact? Sorry about the drink, Martha. Shall I bring you one? (LAUGHTER)

MARTHA LOERKE:

So-- I was hoping no one was gonna talk about Viktor Orban. (LAUGHTER) But let's-- I'll interpret that point just very briefly as an expression of the importance of diversity in any scholarship program. And you have to-- bring forward people you-- A, you can't-- there is no causality.

And B, I wasn't working for OSF when he got the award, but C-- (LAUGHTER) that's how long ago it was, frankly. But C, you have to assume that if you're investing in individuals, there will be a wide-- range of-- results, one way or the other. And we could name quite a few other lousy people that went through scholarship programs-- unfortunately. But I think, if I-- your real point here is that we should not be patting ourselves on the back about positive social change without-- expressing that there is-- a counterfactual that will probably happen, right?

KATE STIMPSON:

Or many different interpretations of (UNINTEL PHRASE)--

MARTHA LOERKE:

Or many different interpretations, understood. Pat, I think you were next to--
(BACKGROUND VOICE) walk up front.
(OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

PAT ROSENFIELD:

(IN PROGRESS) --say something about Susan Barrisford said on-- Patt Rosenfield, and-- a former recipient of the Foundation-- Fellowship, the Rockefeller Foundation, post-doctoral fellowship, and I ran the Carnegie Scholars program for many years, where Martha and I struggled with other people about what do we do about evaluation?

And I-- I want to say that-- I mean, Katherine's-- Kate's comment is a very important one. But I'd like to go back to the question of evaluation-- with what-- and what Susan Barrisford-- indicated with the short time frame, which is a really, really serious problem as I've looked at fellowship programs today.

And one of the things that the Ford Foundation has done historically, but especially with the International Fellowship Program, is showing the importance of a long timeframe, not only for the program itself, but the ten year evaluation that they are founding through IIE.

And I think one of the exciting features of this book is giving more prominence to that. So I hope that not only this widely listened to on the-- this meeting is widely listened to on the OSF-- website, but there is-- a dissemination-- this is my nice comment, (LAUGH) 'cause I have another comment. But-- is-- is-- has a dissemination plan and that includes the important of a long timeframe. But I was struck by the comments about community and positive social change. And also, now that I'm doing more history of fellowship programs, looking at another model that maybe is something we have to talk about.

And I want-- and I haven't read all of the book yet, but I would love to hear if you've looked at what-- several of the foundations had tried-- and other international organizations and that is looking at the context of in-- combining institutional support with individual support.

And I know that there have been programs that have worked with university departments to develop staff development plans. So there are homes for people to go back to so they don't feel like foreigners. I think-- and the comments made today are extremely important. But I haven't seen so much of this. I'm thinking of Amini's point about the community and I'd like to know about the feasibility of this where, instead of working with universities, one thinks of an international higher education program but working with-- community development organizations, NGOs, and building up their capacity, not only at the leadership, but throughout the board.

And I'm-- struck by this with the evaluation of the really remarkable IFP fellows who have gone on, many to work in community organizations, but those organizations don't have the

depth. So it's not just the leader, but the depth of capacity so that you have the strong institutions that are the community-based institutions. So that is where, maybe, the next-- the next development has to go for local philanthropies, international foundations, and-- and international development programs agencies.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Thank you.
(OFF-MIC CONVERSATION)

MARTHA LOERKE:

Yes, please.

ROBIN MARSH:

This is just one thing to follow-up on the timeframe that Susan mentioned and then you reiterated that we have the IFP, which-- you might think is unique, their ten year-- timeframe. But it's also true that the MasterCard Foundation Scholars Program is following in IFP's footsteps.

And they are going to have even longer than ten years, I think, in kind of an indefinite learning evaluation of their alumni-- which-- there are thousands of them. So we would be looking and-- and learning-- from their experience. That's just one thing.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Our long timeframe at OSF means that we have a lot of data and no analysis. But-- (LAUGHTER) but your point is very well-taken on-- on the other opportunities for combined support. We actually do have some history with that here with the academic fellows program that we did-- as well as what Zoe is currently doing in terms of having our graduating grantees-- take up internships at-- NGOS and other organizations that have received organizational grants-- from OSF. So there are some of the beginnings, tiny, of that idea. I'm gonna-- all right. I'm gonna say yes. And Joe, you better be very quick when you go. But please, come forward.

RAJAKA PANDARI:

Thank you, Martha. Rajaka Pandari (PH) from-- IIE. And two sort of quick observations. One was the point that was made right at the beginning that while it's true that when we look at the proportion of scholarships, it might be just the 1% to 2% of outbound mobility.

However, I'd like to argue that the investments made in those scholarships are so substantial and so disproportionately large compared to where else those investments could be made, especially in developing countries and the higher education sectors. Which is why-- so much thought needs to be put into the design and intent of those scholarships.

So that was just an observation. The second thing I wanted to mention is that the discussions that we're having and all of the work that you all and others in this room have done towards this book is so critical and we can begin to see the payoff in some ways. And Joan, this goes back to your remarks about scholarships as-- as a vehicle for development.

That it's really terrific now that in the new sustainable development goals within target four, we have-- within-- within goal four on education, there is actually a specific target-- target 4.b, which specifically focuses on the provision of scholarships-- for students-- at the post-secondary level from the developing world in scholarships provided by the-- by dev-- developed countries.

So I think that that's-- we all should keep an eye on that target. We've been doing-- a lot of work with-- the Unesco Global Education Monitoring Report that's measuring progress towards those targets. And one of the conversations we keep having with them is that they need to move beyond looking just at what governments are doing, but really focusing on all of the private foundation scholarships, which is really-- you know, at the heart of what we're talking about here and everybody gathered in this room. So-- really great book and I think really valuable conversations, thank you.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Thank you, Rajaka. Joe, please. This is Joe Glicksburg from scholarships here at OSF.

JOE GLICKSBURG:

Yes, I just-- I just have a point rather than a question, but it's something that several-- several of the things that people have brought up have made me start thinking about linkages. And it seems to me that one of the most important things you've been talking about in the books is that there are these paradoxes in scholarships.

And that there's this problem with how do we-- evaluate? And it gets back to the timeframe issue that was raised and also issues about-- for instance, do you fund individuals, do you also fund individuals and institutions-- institutions at the same time.
And something you said made me think about-- you-- you mentioned in Africa that there are some of these debates going on about, you know, where universities are trying to be all things for all people. And therefore, resources are getting dispersed in a way that doesn't help anyone.

Whereas, potentially, if you had models where there were regional centers of excellence or something developed in one place or another. And I find this very interesting and I'd like to

talk to you more about what's going on in Africa, 'cause I-- 'cause I've been following the debate the-- in the Palestinian territories that's been-- that's centered around this same question.

Where there's-- the Palestinian territories-- it's interesting, the-- there's a university in the center called Birzeit University, which is between the north and the south. And there's been a president at Birzeit who's been very active, who's been saying, "Why do we have four, five, six universities in the West Bank? We should-- we all know Birzeit is the best," (LAUGHTER) he says.

"So let's just get all the resources and pull it up and-- come on, let's go." And then-- but there's other people who are saying, "No, wait a minute, you know, we-- we wanna have diversity. That could lead to really bad places, having one university in a country as small as this. And we want regional centers of excellence."

So there's another university and (UNINTEL PHRASE) has said, "And yeah, we're gonna become one, we're gonna start a medical school." So they're starting a medical school and their idea-- their long-term strategy for growth is to make that medical school kind of a hub that will attract top talent and then that could spread to other departments, kind of a trickle down-- approach.

And I was thinking about the fact that-- it seems to me that if we want to do what I think-- I fully agree with your point about funding-- a combination of funding individuals with institutions, kind of like what the higher education support program used to do at-- at OSF and still may do at OSF.

That's a very powerful thing. And if we identify the regional centers where these places are developing, those would be places we could strategically invest funds in individuals where there would also be a very clear institutional effect, which would allow us to-- even though I'd like to get away from this kind of measurement and evaluation-- for immediate success-- you know, we would-- we would be able to say, "Look, this has developed.

Our scholarships have funded individuals who've gone back, formed institutions, which are long-lasting entities, that are going to be having an effect long-term. And, we've helped create these centers." And one of the things that's nice about is that you would have, I believe-- people-- local who would be deciding where those centers of excellent would be. It wouldn't be a bunch of people from the U.S. coming in and saying, "You should do X." Like you said, "I like cats." Oh, I like cats too, we all like cats, we're gonna-- you-- you would avoid that conversation. If people were saying, "This is what we've decided we're gonna focus on, we see that there's an alignment with things that we're interested in as donors, and then we combine individual scholarships of work that actually is, at the same time, building individuals, but also building a large institution that has lasting effects."

And you could follow the effect over time with the branching tree bottle (?). You fund-- you fund one person, who's-- founds the center, a center gets strong, other people study at that center, they become professors who have effects here, and you could almost do it-- like a

tracing. And then we would be able to have something that would be a little more rigorous for the people who are demanding evaluation.

MARTHA LOERKE:

Okay. Lots to think about and move on with. But I would just like to take now an opportunity to thank Eric in the back, Zoe in the back, thank you, and our panel. (APPLAUSE)

* * *END OF TRANSCRIPT* * *