

## Cross-References

- ▶ Arbeiterwohlfahrt (AWO)
- ▶ Bundesverband Deutscher Stiftungen
- ▶ Diakonisches Werk der EKD
- ▶ Social Justice
- ▶ Umbrella Organizations

## References/Further Readings

- Boessenecker, K.-H. (1995). *Spitzenverbände der freien Wohlfahrtspflege in der BRD: eine Einführung in Organisationsstrukturen und Handlungsfelder*. Münster, Germany: Votum-Verlag.
- Merchel, J. (1989). *Der Deutsche Paritätische Wohlfahrtsverband. Seine Funktion im korporatistisch gefügten System sozialer Arbeit*. Weinheim, Germany: Dt. Studien-Verlag.

## Parity

- ▶ Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband (Parity)

## Parsons, Ralph Monroe

DAVID B. HOWARD

### Basic Biographical Information

Ralph M. Parsons was born in 1896 in Springs, Long Island, New York and would go on to create one of the world's largest engineering-construction firms. When Parsons was 13, he helped his older brother open a machine shop in Amagansett, Long Island, New York. And instead of finishing high school, he earned a 2 year degree in machine design from the Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York before joining the Navy for training and experience in aeronautical engineering.

In 1931, Parsons went into business for himself and in 1944, Parsons founded the Ralph M. Parsons Company. Under Parsons' direction, the once eight-man engineering business would go on to construct some of the world's largest and most sophisticated petroleum refineries, chemical plants, and mining plants. His company, based in Pasadena, California, also helped pioneer missile and space launch facilities and nuclear plants when almost nothing was known about these technologies.

At the time of Parsons' death, his company had built dozens of major projects in more than 30 countries, including oil and natural gas facilities, shipyards, power plants, irrigation, and water development projects, metal, and mineral mines and processing plants, airports,

subway, and rail lines, sewerage systems, NASA facilities and more.

Today, Parsons is one of the world's largest engineering and construction organizations specializing in infrastructure, transportation, planning, environmental, water, telecommunications, and more. The company's revenues exceeded \$3.8 billion and employed 11,500 people in 2008.

Parsons died in 1974 at his home San Marino, California.

### Major Accomplishments/Contributions

In 1961, Parsons founded the Ralph M. Parsons Foundation as the charitable giving arm of his company. Upon his death, he left the Foundation 600,000 shares of Parsons Company stock and \$4 million in cash. In 1968, Parsons was elected a trustee of Harvey Mudd College in Claremont, California and in 1970, the Hydrodynamics Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was renamed the Ralph M. Parsons Laboratory. In 1976, 2 years after he died, the foundation became fully independent of the company, with which it now shares only Mr. Parsons' name.

In 2007, the foundation – a leading funder in Southern California – had assets of over \$450 million and total giving for the year exceeded \$22 million.

Today, the Ralph M. Parsons Foundation continues to strive to support and facilitate the work of Southern California's best nonprofit organizations, recognizing that many of those in need today will go on to shape the future of region. The foundation focuses on four main areas: social impact, civic and cultural programs, health and higher education.

### Cross-References

- ▶ Foundations, Corporate
- ▶ Grantmaking Foundations

## Participation

RANJITA MOHANTY<sup>1,2</sup>, RAJESH TANDON<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Independent Consultant, New Delhi, India

<sup>2</sup>Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi, India

<sup>3</sup>ORIA, New Delhi, India

### Introduction and Definition

Participation is the inclusion of knowledge, identities, and voice of the marginalized in the social, economic, and

political affairs that affect them. Participation and civil society work in close conjunction. Participation is intrinsic to civil society because as the autonomous space for social action, civil society fosters inclusion, generates public debate, checks authoritarianism and deepens democracy. Participation covers a wide range: large scale mobilization for nationalist struggle against colonialism, for civil liberties and for the restoration of democracy in the authoritarian regimes; it also manifests in protests against modernization, development, and globalization; participation is also about localized everyday activities to counter social exclusion, corruption, poverty, and gender inequality. Civil society in various forms such as social movements, community groups, philanthropic organizations, development support organizations and advocacy networks facilitates participation in diverse ways. Civil society provides the space in which participation is practiced; participation in turn by building solidarity among people strengthens the sphere of civil society.

### Historical Background

Historically, the roots of participation can be traced to the anticolonial movements in many parts of the world. The nationalist struggles sowed the seeds of engagement and the desire for freedom among ordinary people. The desire to be treated as equal, get inclusion in the wider society and polity marked the civil rights movement against racial injustice in the United States in the early 1960s and the antiapartheid movement in South Africa in the 1970 and 1980s. The claims for racial justice gradually spread to include gender justice, justice for ecologically vulnerable, for indigenous people, and people with vulnerable diseases and disabilities such as HIV-AIDS.

In the ex-colonies another stream of participation manifested against the modernizing drives of the independent states. First articulated as reaction against the growth and efficiency orientation of development that was lacking in redistributive aspects to eradicate poverty, participation, however, could not proceed beyond mere identifying the basic need of people. In those popular days of development, the faith on it was so absolute that redistribution was thought possible by identifying people's basic need through their participation in development. As a modernizing process, development was still looked at as value neutral, rational, conflict free and efficient. The hegemonizing dimension of development was still to be unraveled; its non-egalitarian tendencies were still to be questioned. When that happened, participation began to be associated with the issues of "power." The dominance of knowledge, interests, and relations that development generates and serves, and the exclusion of the poor, their knowledge,

interests, and their community relations generated much debate on who controls development. Grassroots movements and activists in many Third World countries began articulating the disappointments and violence of development and advocated for development to be inclusive and participatory (Rehnema & Bawtree, 1997).

In the 1970s and 1980s participation manifested in the wave of democracy that swept through the hegemonic regimes, both orthodox Marxist and military, in the countries of East-Central Europe, Latin America and Africa thus reflecting the incongruence between the state and society on desirable political conditions under which people would like to live. The fall of communism and military dictatorship mirrored the aspirations of ordinary people to carve out an autonomous space for collective action to act as a counter to state power. These aspirations drove home two messages: they affirmed the desire and competency of ordinary people to define both political and social good and their terms of engagement with the state; and second, they affirmed the strength of collective action in achieving their desired political and social goals. Thus participation, which began with carving out a space away from the prying eyes of the state, where people could discuss the essence of freedom, autonomy, and dignity of human existence, in due course of time became a politically volatile force to bring down the most authoritarian regimes (Tandon & Mohanty, 2003).

The contexts, both national and global changed significantly with the end of the Cold War. With the emergence of the Washington Consensus, structural adjustment in the Third World countries, and advent of globalization and neoliberalism, development began to be associated with governance and democracy, and participation with citizenship. The recent upsurge of interest in citizenship and participation has its root in the emergence of these new models of development and governance. Along with the changed and minimized role of the state and increased intervention of the market, we also witness in recent times an increased emphasis on the role of citizens in making governance transparent and accountable. The discourses on development and democracy now appear to be intricately woven around the role of citizens in influencing the forces that govern their lives. Whether it is the political processes of democracy or the socioeconomic processes of development, citizen participation is considered as the key. Their participation is considered important in making development humane and governance inclusive. This represents a shift in the way people are seen vis-à-vis governance. That is, from the state centric governance where people were considered as beneficiaries and recipients of state policies, and from

the market driven affairs where people are treated as mere consumers, we have arrived at a juncture where finally people are recognized as “citizens” with rights to engage and participate in the processes and institutions of development and governance (Cornwall, 2000). There are two strands of thought that make the “citizen” an important agent in the new framework of governance. Along one strand, derived from the rights-based approach, there is now emphasis on the rights of citizens to make claims, demand engagement, define priorities and hold the state accountable. Along the other, derived from the associations of people as a countervailing force to the state, citizens are seen as watchdogs in democracy performing the important function of keeping the state under surveillance and holding it accountable.

## Key Issues

### Participation as Inclusion

Inclusion is the basic premise on which participation rests. There are three critical ways in which inclusion of the marginalized is valued: inclusion of their knowledge; inclusion of their identities; and inclusion of their voice. The early protagonists of popular knowledge first challenged the premise that knowledge was the monopoly of experts and professionally trained personnel. This challenge was posed on the basis of evidence from everyday life of struggles and achievements of poor people. Uncovering the dynamics of power in the pursuits and promotion of knowledge was seen as a necessary condition for the promotion of participation by ordinary people (Tandon, 2008). People’s knowledge and agency in bringing about changes in their lived situation was practiced and popularized by Paulo Freire and Myles Horton. Freire’s work on adult education in Brazil centered around conscientization which aimed at uncovering the power of popular knowledge. Freire called this process “liberating.” Likewise, the work of Myles Horton in Southern USA around labor and civil rights focused on people’s knowledge in shaping their agency for transformatory action. Participatory research captures this transformatory perspective of people’s knowledge, and articulates alternative, people-centric conceptions of knowledge, education, and action (Tandon, 2002).

Along with the inclusion of marginalized knowledge, inclusion of marginalized identities and voices is required to level the playing fields for them to live with equality and dignity. Creating these conditions, however, is not easy as those who bear the vulnerable identities of poor, ethnic minorities, racially subjugated, indigenous, and women have been historically subjugated. Inclusion in

this context is not about creating new identities, but giving “recognition” to identities that have lived under oppression. Democratic states try to equalize the privileged and powerless by conferring universal citizenship identity and status. That, however, hides their tenuous relationship, as citizenship experiences, as different from the formal identity and status, is contingent on the particular context in which the marginalized live (Mohanty & Tandon, 2006). Hence, recognition of differences and deprivation is critical for creating inclusive citizenship. Identity mobilizations in many parts of the world have strived not to negate, but to reassert the oppressed identities to make claims on the state and on the wider society in which people live.

Much like marginalized identities, marginalized voice can be subjugated, neglected, and bypassed by those in power. Hence, for the inclusion of marginalized voice in the affairs of development and governance as well as in everyday affairs of society, their voices need to be enabled, mobilized, and amplified. If the identities and voices of racially subjugated Blacks have manifested as civil liberties movements in the United States and as antiapartheid movement in South Africa, the feminist movement has universal appeal all over the world in bringing about gender justice.

As evident from the above discussion, participation as inclusion is essentially about giving power to the powerless. These empowering processes take place in a variety of spaces created both by the state and civil society. The spaces, however, are not neutral and what shape participation takes within these spaces depends on who creates the spaces, who rules, who is accepted and who is not (Cornwall, 2002). The state-created institutions, created through state policies and regulated by state norms, create spaces into which people are called upon to participate. These new participatory institutions set up by the states in the last decade in many Southern countries are expected to engage people in decentralized local governance. These statutory spaces, referred to as “invited spaces” have opened up possibilities for grassroots participation in decision-making about local development and governance, but as state-created and regulated spaces they also suffer many limitations and their potential to encourage substantive participation of the marginalized groups often comes under severe scrutiny (Cornwall & Coelho, 2007). Civil society, which is not bounded by the state laws and functions as the autonomous space for social action, offers spaces which are very different from the state-created invited spaces. Spaces for participation that occupy the civil society sphere are accommodative of interests and demands of the marginalized. Such spaces act as

enabler, voice-giver, facilitator, and mediator. Such spaces may get created organically and spontaneously by people whose interests are at threat and who want to raise the issue; they may also get created by civil society organizations who help collectivize and mobilize people to address issues. However, there is nothing inherently virtuous about civil society that automatically safeguards these spaces from being captured by dominant interests. Only when poor and powerless keep a vigil and animate the sphere of civil society that it resonates with their inclusion (Chandhoke, 1995). We elaborate below participation as it takes place in various civil society spaces.

### Civil Society and Participation

The rise of the idea of civil society in contemporary times owes it to the popular movements that led to the collapse of authoritarian states and installation of democracy in many parts of the world. The conceptualizations of civil society that vest it with the task of democratization are rooted in two traditions. The revolutionary imagery of civil society makes it a site for contestation, where people counterpoise them against state power and either replace or reform it (Keane, 1998, 1988a, b; Chandhoke, 1995). A second stream of conceptualization, which links civil society to the state, is the Tocquevillian interpretation of civic associations performing the role of watchdogs in a democracy (Tocqueville, 1990). This linkage of civic associations with democracy is further supported by Putnam (1993), who, drawing on his experience in North Italy, advocates strong civic associations for establishing a strong democratic tradition. A conceptualization that completely divorces civil society from the state is provided by Walzer (1992), who refers to it as the uncovered realm of society where social affairs are conducted without any reference to or interference by the state or market. Voluntary groups who serve the poor and the needy fall into this Walzarian conceptualization of civil society. The spread of liberalization of the economy has furthered the conceptualization of civil society as a separate “sector,” different from the state and the market (Cohen & Arato, 1992). The conceptualization of civil society as a third sector – the state being the first and market, the second – has been effected in recent times by clubbing together various actors such as NGOs, community-based organizations, social movements and charitable trusts under the umbrella of third sector. Tandon and Mohanty (2002) take the view that civil society is characterized by the notion of public good as seen from the vantage point of the poor and marginalized.

Here we invoke the idea of “space” to describe what civil society offers to the marginalized, how different

spaces hold the promise for participation to be practiced in different forms, and thus contribute to the larger agenda of inclusion and empowerment. Civil society fosters inclusion in three significant ways: creating and expanding the “public space” where issues are voiced, debated, and democratized; creating “other spaces” for mobilizing people to claim their rights and demand accountability; and connecting the marginalized voices with those in decision-making authority by occupying the “mediating spaces.”

“Public space” is conceptualized as a space which is accommodative of plurality and diversity and where people can gather to deliberate as equals and create and influence a public will or consensus (Habermas, 1989). The public, as opposed to the private sphere of the family or the private sphere of specific parochial alliances, is a sphere where social and culturally ascribed differences as well as differences of achieved materiality are put aside and interaction and deliberation takes place among individuals as equals. Equality is thus the defining criteria of public space and that makes it the site for nurturing and flourishing of democratic aspirations for inclusion. An expanded public sphere where diverse identities come together to participate as equals is the *sine qua non* of inclusive citizenship. Civil society is instrumental in creating and expanding the public space to accommodate the knowledge, identities, and voice of the marginalized (Mohanty, 2006). Social movements, public hearings, advocacy campaigns, discussion forums all are examples of how public space for the marginalized is created, expanded, and protected.

Despite all the conceptualizations of public sphere as a site for freedom and equality, in reality public space can also be a site for perpetuation of exclusion, a site for suppressing voices and a site for exercising dominance. That is, public sphere can not be treated as virtuous or normative, though we can treat it as a normatively desirable sphere. Public sphere also can not be treated simply as a given. That is, those who are more susceptible than others to get excluded, must constantly guard the public space to make it an equalizing site. The private relationships of family and the social relationships of race, caste, or culture or for that matter class can play their discriminating roles in the public sphere. Thus women can be restricted by the patriarchal family and social relationships, low castes in India and Blacks in South Africa can be restricted by the inequalities of the social and cultural structure, indigenous people can be restricted by their cultural isolation from the mainstream living, poor can be excluded by the rich. Hence, those seeking inclusion and striving to raise their voice have to struggle against

odds to expand both the boundary and content of the public sphere to make it inclusive.

The “other spaces” (Mohanty, 2004, 2007, forthcoming) where the powerless are protected from both the state and social power are spaces where people learn the arts and skills of mobilization. As such mobilization offers multiple learning to people who inhabit these spaces. People learn to identify problems, engage in collective reflection and analysis; they also learn to build collectives and networks that offer solidarity and support to the cause. These other spaces, as evident from social movements, may arise spontaneously; such spaces are also planned and designed by organizations working for the marginalized. Other spaces raise their consciousness about rights; make people trust their skills; enable them to capture the public space; equip them with information about the motive of the rulers and ways to deal with them; and impart them the skills of articulation and communication. Mobilization offers people what they would not have done on their own due to their lack of material resources, or resources of language and articulation, or organizational resources. Besides the strategic value of other spaces, these spaces are also important for the solidarity, warmth, and oneness of purpose they offer. The other spaces, therefore, connect between what Lefebvre (1991) terms as representational spaces that are social and live spaces, and the representations of structured, planned, and controlled spaces of institutions.

The “mediating space” (Mohanty, forthcoming) works as the middle space between the interests of the powerless and those who occupy seats of authority. The existence of the middle space that is created from below is crucial for democracy as it is in this space that representation and negotiations of interests take place. Civil society occupies and offers the middle space from where it mediates between the interests of the powerless with those who wield social and political power on the one hand, and on the other, between powerless and those in seats of authority in the governance institutions. The middle space has been considerably reinvented by neoliberalism in the partnership model it popularized in which the state and civil society are viewed as partners in governance. As the state outsources to civil society not only delivery of services but also the agenda of building democracy in state sponsored projects and institutions, which at least theoretically was part of state agenda, the state and civil society actors are now willing to sit together for deliberation. The role civil society plays in the partnership framework expects civil society to do what the government finds unable to: for instance, dissemination of information in popular

language, awareness building and capacity building through training. It is the absence of the state that civil society fills in when it occupies the middle space and negotiates the interests of the marginalized with the state.

There are many forms in which civil society manifests in the spaces mentioned above to foster inclusion and empowerment of the marginalized. The dominant and near universal forms of civil society are mentioned below. This list, however, is not exhaustive and the typologies are not mutually exclusive; they only help in understanding various civil society formations in contemporary times.

### **Social Movements**

Social movements are mass based mobilizations that often arise as forms of protest. The issues that movements address relate to the needs and interests of the poor and marginalized. Social movements cover a wide range. Some examples include: rights and entitlements for women, for African-Americans in the United States and for first nation people in Canada; resource distribution for the poor; ecological safeguard; and fallouts of globalization in the developing countries.

### **Community Based Organization**

Community based organizations draw membership from the specific community and serve its interest. Such organizations serving cultural, economic, or even recreational purposes may get formed spontaneously such as youth organizations, or they are formed as part of developmental interventions such as education committees or forest committees as is evident in Indian villages. Community based groups help share resources, enable mutual aid and support, and build collective strength. A recent form of self-help is the small micro-credit groups that have surfaced in many Third World countries through development programs. Initially formed as saving and credit groups, these collectives in many contexts have mobilized to address many other issues facing their communities.

### **Intermediary**

This category of civil society organizations includes those organizations that mobilize people to address issues of concern as well as those who mediate between the interests of the marginalized with those in positions of power in society, polity, and in the sphere of economy. An important function of intermediary civil society is to enable and facilitate community based groups, mobilization organizations and other intermediary organizations. Support functions often include research and information sharing, capacity building and networking activities.

Examples include: PRIA (Society for Participatory Research in Asia) in India, MWENGO (Mwelekeo wa NGO – which means direction & vision of NGOs) in Eastern and Southern Africa, and IDARSA (Institute for Democracy in South Africa) in South Africa.

### Philanthropic

Philanthropic civil society is based on the principles and spirit of charity and covers such services for the poor as: shelter, education, health care, food security etc. Many philanthropic organizations have their roots in religious organization such as church or temples. Individual donations also help support philanthropic work. Several corporate houses have philanthropy programs like the Tata Trusts in India and the Gates Foundation in the United States. Philanthropic organizations such as Charities Aid Foundation in the United Kingdom help in mobilizing resources from other sources for charitable purpose.

### Advocacy

Advocacy civil society organizations have been set up with the explicit purpose of advocating on a specific cause. Environment, gender, human rights are some of the critical issues that advocacy organizations have taken up in many parts of the world. Greenpeace, Amnesty International, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative are some illustrations of advocacy manifestations of civil society.

### Network

Network organizations are associations of other organizations and act as a collective to extend their voice and strength. Some networks are focused on a specific theme, such as CIVICUS that aims at promotion of citizen alliance. Networks are also formed to help and serve the interests of their member organizations – for example, Voluntary Action Network India (VANI) which function as a network of pan-Indian civil society organizations.

### Cross-References

- ▶ Advocacy
- ▶ Amnesty International
- ▶ Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- ▶ Charities Aid Foundation
- ▶ CIVICUS
- ▶ Citizenship
- ▶ Civil Society and Democracy
- ▶ Civil Society Theory: Cohen and Arato
- ▶ Civil Society Theory: Keane
- ▶ Civil Society Theory: de Tocqueville

- ▶ Civil Society Theory: Walzer
- ▶ Collective Action
- ▶ Freire, Paulo
- ▶ Good Governance
- ▶ Horton, Myles
- ▶ Identity
- ▶ Intermediary Organizations and Field
- ▶ Public Sphere
- ▶ Putnam, Robert
- ▶ Self-help Groups
- ▶ Social Justice
- ▶ Social Movements
- ▶ Solidarity
- ▶ Tata Trusts

### References/Further Readings

- Chandhoke, N. (1995). *State and civil society: Explorations in political theory*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Cohen L. J., & Arato A. (1992). *Civil society and political theory*. England: The MIT Press.
- Cohen, J., & Andrew, A. (1992). *Political theory and civil society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cornwall, A., & Coelho S. V. (2007). *Spaces for change?*. London: Zed books.
- Cornwall, A. (2000). *Beneficiary, consumer, citizen: Perspectives on participation for poverty reduction*. *Sida Studies No. 2*, Stockholm: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
- Cornwall, A. (2002). *Making spaces, changing places: Situating participation in development*. UK: IDS, Sussex.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Keane, J. (1998). *Civil society: Old images, new visions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keane, J. (1988a). *Democracy and civil society*. London: Verso.
- Keane, J. (1988b). *Civil society and the state*. London: Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mohanty, R. (forthcoming). Infinite agenda of social justice: Dalit mobilization in the institutions of local governance. In V. S. Coelho & B. V. Liere (Eds.), *Mobilizing for democracy*. London: Zed books.
- Mohanty, R. (2004). Institutional dynamics and participatory spaces: The making and unmaking of participation in local forest management in India. *IDS Bulletin*, 35, 26–32.
- Mohanty, R. (2006). Citizen participation in development: Issues of identity, inclusion and voice. In R. Mohanty & R. Tandon (Eds.), *Participatory citizenship: Identity, exclusion, inclusion*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Mohanty, R. (2007). Gendered subjects, the state and participatory spaces: The politics of domesticating participation. In A. Cornwall & V. S. Coelho (Eds.), *Spaces for change? The politics of participation in new democratic arenas*. London: Zed Books.
- Mohanty, R., & Tandon, R. (2006). *Participatory citizenship: Identity, exclusion, inclusion*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rahnama, M., & Bwete, V. (1997). *The post-development reader*. London: Zed Books.

- Tandon, R. (2002). Knowledge as power: Participatory research as the alternative. In R. Tandon (Ed.), *Participatory research: Revisiting the roots*. New Delhi: Mosaic.
- Tandon, R. (2008). Wither participatory methodologies? *Participation and Governance*, 1(2), 108–111.
- Tandon, R., & Mohanty, R. (2002). *Civil society and governance*. Delhi: Samskriti.
- Tandon, R., & Mohanty, R. (2003). *Does civil society matter? Governance in contemporary India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Tocqueville, A. (1990). *Democracy in America* (H. Keene, Trans., Vols. 1 & 2). New York: Colonial Press.
- Walzer, M. (1992). *The civil society argument*. In C. Mauffe (Ed.), *Dimensions of radical democracy*. London: Verso.

## Partnership for Philanthropic Planning

RICHARD D. WATERS

### Address of Organization

233 McCrea Street, Suite 400  
Indianapolis, IN 46225  
USA

[www.pppnet.org](http://www.pppnet.org)

### Introduction

Originally created in 1988 as the National Committee on Planned Giving, the Partnership for Philanthropic Planning (PPP) seeks to help people and organizations create charitable giving experiences that are the most meaningful in achieving both charitable mission and the philanthropic, financial, family, and personal goals of the donor.

Each year, the PPP engages in research, education programs, and advocacy to examine the best practices in philanthropic planning and develop the standards for planned giving and major gift officers to follow in their daily activities. PPP strives to engage all constituents in the charitable gift planning process: planned giving and major gifts professionals, nonprofit managers and trustees, financial, and estate planners, trust managers and administrators. By bringing these groups together, the PPP helps maximize the value of charitable giving by helping fundraisers provide the most meaningful charitable giving experience for donors; helping financial planning professionals provide their clients with excellent advice on charitable giving and estate planning; and helping nonprofit managers and trustees better accomplish the missions of their organizations through philanthropic planning.

### Brief History

In 1969, Congress passed the Tax Reform Act changing the way Americans could make charitable contributions. This was the major impetus for the creation of the field of planned giving. During the 1970s the planned giving profession was in its infancy, but by the end of the decade many organizations were beginning to see its vast potential. In the early 1980s, groups of professionals involved in gift planning began to have meetings to discuss the feasibility of a national organization to act as a coordinator and facilitator for networking the various professionals and organizations involved in planned giving.

After a meeting in Chicago in October, 1985, those in attendance felt there was a significant need for a national organization to provide services and training for planned giving officers. They felt that the mission of this organization would be twofold: to provide quality educational opportunities for gift planning professionals and to unite the growing number of local planned giving groups already forming in larger metropolitan areas.

Three years later in January, 1988, the National Committee on Planned Giving opened its office in Indianapolis, Indiana to facilitate, coordinate, and encourage the education and training of the planned giving community, and to facilitate effective communication among the many different professionals in this community. The organization functioned for the first 10 years as a federation of planned giving councils, and then added a membership category for individuals in 2001. In 2009, NCPG changed its name to the Partnership for Philanthropic Planning.

### Mission

The organization was created to facilitate, coordinate, and encourage the education and training of the planned giving community, and to facilitate effective communication among the many different professionals in this community. Despite the organization changes experienced in 2009, the organization continues with a mission to help people and organizations create mutually-beneficial giving experiences. Organizational leaders feel the mission can be met by focusing on four priorities: (1) engaging all of the constituencies critical to the philanthropic planning process, (2) providing unique programs and services, (3) implementing successful models of collaboration and partnership, and (4) creating brand awareness and support.

### Activities

To achieve its mission, the organization is involved in a variety of education and information sharing activities.