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Case Studies
Executive Summary

The Eisenhower Fellowships (EF) was created in 1953 in honor of President Dwight D. Eisenhower as a means of promoting international understanding and peace through the exchange of information, ideas, and perspectives among emerging leaders from different countries. EF’s Multi-Nation Program (MNP) brings highly accomplished mid-career professionals from around the world to the United States to travel, meet with high-level contacts in their fields of interest, and participate in seminars, retreats and discussions with a cohort of international fellows. Two additional programs have been added to EF during the last 50 years—the Single Nation or Single Region Program (SNP/SRP), which brings groups of professionals from one region of the world to the U.S., and the USA Program, which sends professionals from the United States abroad. Fellows in all three programs enjoy individualized itineraries of travel, cultural immersion, and meetings tailored to their interests and goals and have the option of having their spouse join them for part or all of the travel experience.

In February 2004, EF hired the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning (OMG) to conduct an evaluation of their programs. OMG’s evaluation focused on discerning impacts that the program has had on fellows, and on their institutions and societies as well. It also looked at the activities of the EF staff in facilitating the program. Our evaluation consisted of the following methods:

- A review of EF materials and interviews with EF staff, trustees, and fellows to discern and document how the program functions and its desired outcomes
- In-depth case studies of 15 alumni and key informants to gather rich, detailed examples of program impacts
- A survey of all alumni to collect a breadth of data on program experiences and outcomes

Prior to conducting the case studies and survey work, OMG engaged EF staff and stakeholders in structured discussions to articulate their understanding about how the program works and the connections that are thought to exist between the program’s activities (or inputs) and outcomes. This activity was critical because it provided a roadmap showing the types of outcomes that the evaluation would look for. It also challenged EF staff to elaborate and agree on a set of desired outcomes for the program.

The outcomes identified by EF staff, trustees, and fellows are listed on the next page. They are grouped into three categories: individual-level, organizational-level, and societal-level outcomes. Concerning individual-level changes, one would expect that if EF were successful, a fellow would experience changes in his/her personal self. For example, the fellow may develop a better understanding of the U.S. (or country visited), learn specific skills, gain increased self-confidence, or develop a clearer vision of their personal and professional goals. In the organizational-level outcomes category, the fellow is sharing and/or applying the learning gained during EF to his/her work, career track, network, and organization; and with friends, family, and colleagues. The societal-level category is for definite, tangible impacts affecting large groups of people, such as new programs, policies, institutions, and systems of operation and management.

Finally, we have included “ideal” outcomes, which EF staff and stakeholders hope the program contributes to. It is beyond the scope of the current evaluation to measure these outcomes or attribute them to EF. However, it is important to articulate the ideals that the program strives for. The arrows on the chart indicate that individual-level changes are likely to develop first and lead to organizational and societal-level outcomes. Staff and stakeholders also recognize that
outcomes develop differently among fellows; therefore, the categories are not meant to correspond with specific time periods or suggest that one category is more important than the rest.

**PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Broadened perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Enhanced professional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Improved leadership awareness and capacity, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assertion of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition of leadership by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ New relationships, networks, and alliances with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional contacts, often high level, from U.S. (or country visited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fellows in cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EF alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EF staff, trustees, PAC and sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Heightened cross-cultural and international perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ More comprehensive understanding of the U.S. and its key institutions (or of the country visited, for USA program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL-LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Application of broader perspective and/or knowledge gained during EF to work in current or new fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Assuming positions of greater influence and scope; exerting more effective leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Strong personal and professional networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Strong EF network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ongoing relationships, communication, and partnerships with contacts from U.S., fellows in cohort, EF alumni, country associations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Sharing knowledge and perspective gained during fellowship with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Improvements or growth in fellows’ organizations and institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIETAL-LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Fellows make more and deeper impacts in current or new professional fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Fellows develop strategic collaborations that result in new and/or improved activities, programs, or institutions, with benefits extending to a broader constituency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Progress and advancements that benefit society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Greater mutual understanding and peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Findings**

Key findings of the evaluation are based on the alumni survey as well as a cross analysis of the case studies. Brief descriptions of each methodology are included as sidebars within this summary. Main findings relate to the outcomes or effects of EF; however, the report also presents alumni feedback concerning specific EF activities, and suggestions for improvement. Since the study is based primarily on feedback from fellows, it should be considered as a mirror reflecting the thoughts and experiences of alumni.

All evaluation findings show that Eisenhower Fellowships is a powerful experience that has positive effects on fellows’ personal and professional lives. When asked to rate the program’s overall effects on their development, fellows responding to OMG’s survey gave the experience a high score of 3.7 on a scale from 0 (an extremely negative experience) to 4 (an extremely positive experience).¹

¹ This (3.7) rating is the average out of all the ratings given by individual survey respondents.
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**Evaluation Findings: Summary**

- Eisenhower Fellowships has strong individual-level effects on participating fellows—including broadened cross-cultural and international perspective, knowledge, goals and leadership skills, as well as understanding of the country visited.

- EF has moderate effects on fellows' organizations and societies, including improvements to existing organizations and the creation of new programs, policies, and institutions.

- Program impact is stronger among international fellows (MNP and SNP/SRP programs) than for USA fellows, particularly concerning societal-level outcomes.

- Alumni are very satisfied with activities during the fellowship, particularly meetings with professionals and discussions among cohort members.

- Some but not all alumni are maintaining EF relationships, and most with active EF associations in their country have been involved either currently or in the past.

- Alumni desire more post-fellowship activities and networking opportunities coordinated by EF; they also suggest that EF increase public relations efforts so the program is better-known.

Survey data show that EF contributes strongly to individual-level outcomes for most fellows (see figure below). Eighty-one (81) percent of respondents said that the program had a moderate to strong effect on all of the following: their professional knowledge, international perspective, understanding of the U.S. (or country visited), ideas and plans for their work, personal and professional goals, self-confidence, their ideas about leadership, and their perception of themselves as a leader. Among these individual-level effects, alumni felt that the program contributed most strongly to their understanding of the country visited, and their international perspective.

Fifty-seven (57) percent of the fellows also reported organizational-level outcomes as a result of their fellowship experience. In particular, these respondents said that EF had led to improvements in their organizations or institutions. Societal-level outcomes were difficult to attribute solely or directly to the program, but about half (51%) of the survey respondents said that EF had led to new programs, policies, organizations or institutions, which were often a result of strategic collaborations. Fellows’ descriptions of these outcomes, which are presented in the body of this report, paint an impressive portrait of new programs, policies, and collaborations.

The case studies lend further support to the overall finding that EF contributes very strongly to individual-level outcomes, and that it contributes moderately to organizational-level and societal-level outcomes. Both the fellows who
were interviewed for case studies and their key informants described how EF led to personal and professional changes in fellows’ lives.

OMG repeated the analysis in the figure above looking for differences in outcomes among various groups of survey respondents. The most noticeable pattern that we found—and the only one that was statistically significant—was the one corresponding to EF program (MNP, SNP/SRP, or USA). USA fellows reported weaker outcomes as a result of their fellowship than fellows in the international programs. These differences were consistent across individual-level, organizational-level, and societal-level outcomes but were statistically significant only for societal-level outcomes. The USA program is the most recent as well as the smallest EF program in terms of cohort size, and the cohort meets less frequently and less intensively than cohorts in the MNP and SNP/SRP programs. USA fellows generally travel for a shorter period of time, as well. These variations may account for some of the differences in reported outcomes.

While the results were not statistically significant, our analyses also suggest that program outcomes may vary according to the personal characteristics of fellows, particularly their age at the time of the fellowship. Fellows who were older (above age 45) when they participated in EF reported more organizational and societal-level outcomes than younger fellows.

Other key findings of the evaluation include:

- Forty-one (41) percent of survey respondents reported changing professions or fields since their fellowship. These changes were not always positive, nor were they necessarily due to the fellowship; therefore this result should be viewed as a descriptor reminding the reader that EF fellows are a population likely to experience high levels of career transition.

- Some but not all fellows are maintaining the relationships they formed during EF. When asked how often they currently have contact with fellows from their cohort, with EF alumni in their country, with professionals they visited while traveling, and with EF staff and stakeholders, less than a third of survey respondents reported frequent contact.

---

**Alumni Survey**

27 Questions  
Conducted online with follow-up by mail for those without email addresses  
Sent to 785 alumni via email and 331 via mail  
Response rate: 40%

**Respondent Characteristics**

Program:  
MNP 64%  
SNP/SRP 20%  
USA 16%

Year of Fellowship:  
Before 1985 27%  
1985 – 1994 26%  
1995 – 2004 47%

Gender:  
Male 78%  
Female 22%

Continent (international alumni only):  
Europe 37%  
Asia 26%  
South America 16%  
Middle East 6%  
North America 6%  
Africa 6%  
Oceania 3%

Average age at fellowship: 41

Spouse participation: 71%

---

2 Throughout this report, “statistically significant” results are those that we are at least 95% certain are not due to chance. While many of the differences that we discuss in this report were not “statistically significant”, they do represent notable findings and trends.
Alumni were very satisfied with the fellowship activities (for example, orientation, appointments with professionals, and closing seminar). They particularly valued the meetings with professionals, and interactions and discussions with their cohort members. However, USA fellows interviewed for case studies consistently lamented the lack of a cohort experience similar to that in the international programs. Another aspect of the fellowship that alumni valued was the opportunity for their spouses to participate.

Concerning activities that occur post-fellowship, 92% of respondents from a country with an active alumni group said that they were somewhat or very involved with the group. Many are also involved in EF recruitment and nominations, and in providing hospitality or professional contacts and support to visiting fellows.

By far the most common topic that fellows discussed when asked how they would improve the program was post-fellowship activities. Some made the general suggestion that EF strengthen the alumni network, including more frequent and more facilitated communication among fellows. Other suggestions dealt with strengthening alumni activities or associations in specific countries or regions, or becoming engaged in specific types of projects together.

Alumni and selected stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation do not believe that EF is very well-known in their countries. Case studies, survey data, and interviews with trustees and stakeholders support this finding. Also, the second most common suggestion that fellows made for program improvement was to increase public relations about the program. They also suggested enlarging EF and establishing regional offices to increase the program’s presence in different parts of the world.

### Case Studies

15 case studies

Based on interviews with fellows and up to two key informants (individuals who have known the fellow since before the fellowship)

Feature alumni from various continents, programs, and fields

Full case studies (4 – 6 pages long each) included in a separate report available from EF

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of the evaluation, OMG offers the following recommendations for the consideration of EF staff, trustees, and other stakeholders.

- **Strengthen USA program.** Based on differences in reported outcomes among EF programs, staff and stakeholders should explore ways in which the USA program could be made more similar to the international program experience, for example by strengthening the cohort experience. Consideration should also be given to any differences that exist in how fellows are communicated with or organized for alumni activities following the fellowship.

- **Recognize differential program effects and supports needed.** While differences in outcomes according to age and gender were not statistically significant, the patterns that emerged suggest that different types of people have more or less to gain from EF depending on their experiences before the fellowship. In order to maximize the program’s impact for all fellows, EF may want to consider a closer examination of how
the program affects different groups, particularly women and younger fellows. Focus groups would be one means of conducting such an examination and could be carried out at an EF conference or gathering.

- **Continue to build on program strengths.** EF should continue to use cohort meetings and discussions to augment the travel experience for international fellows, and consider ways to further highlight or enhance this aspect of the program since fellows find it to be particularly effective. EF should also preserve spousal participation in the program, as this is a unique and valued aspect of the fellowship, and one that is utilized by most fellows.

- **Recognize and support career transitions.** EF alumni are a population likely to experience high levels of career transition following the fellowship, and this should be taken into account in program planning. EF staff should discuss career progression and the possibility of career change with fellows, including how such changes may impact leadership and personal and professional growth. The program should also consider whether the impacts that fellows gain from EF are sustainable throughout career transitions. EF should avoid becoming narrowly focused on specific job skills or knowledge, and may similarly want to avoid selecting fellows who are narrowly focused. The program should also consider how to provide resources and support to alumni when they experience career transitions, for example by linking them with other alumni in their new professional field.

- **Strengthen alumni activities.** Fellows’ suggestions for program improvement clearly indicate the desire for more alumni activities and networking opportunities; however, they would like these opportunities to be organized and facilitated for them. Stronger facilitation of post-fellowship activities may have many benefits—for example, stronger relationships among alumni and between alumni and EF staff and stakeholders. These relationships are in place to some extent currently; however, strengthening them could lead to the development of additional organizational-level and societal-level outcomes.

- **Explore whether and how to raise program visibility.** EF should consider whether enhancing the program’s profile and level of visibility is a priority. If it is, explore options for doing so, keeping in mind that since EF is a far-reaching program, this will be a challenging task. The program may want to consider targeted approaches—for example, raising its profile in specific countries.

- **Develop a self-evaluation model to continue to assess program impact.** EF should continue to evaluate its programs using one-year and five-year post-fellowship surveys. Surveying alumni one year after their fellowship and again four years later would allow staff and stakeholders to collect a rich set of data indicating how and when impacts develop following the EF experience. Implementing these surveys would also allow EF to maintain more consistent communication with fellows and collect updated contact information from them.
Introduction

The Eisenhower Fellowships (EF) was created in 1953 in honor of President Dwight D. Eisenhower as a means of promoting international understanding and peace through the exchange of information, ideas, and perspectives among emerging leaders from different countries. Eisenhower Fellowships’ flagship program, the Multi-Nation Program (MNP), brings professionals from around the world to the United States to travel, meet with high-level contacts in their fields of interest, and participate in seminars, retreats and discussions with a cohort of international fellows. Two additional programs have been added to EF during the last 50 years—the Single Nation or Single Region Program (SNP/SRP), which brings groups of professionals from one region of the world to the U.S., and the USA Program, which sends professionals from the United States abroad. Fellows in all three programs enjoy individualized itineraries of meetings and travel tailored to their interests and goals, and have the option of having their spouse join them for part or all of the travel experience.

Stated goals of the Eisenhower Fellowships are to:

- Enhance the capacities of leaders who are likely to have increasing impacts on their nation’s development, by building individualized programs of professional inquiry and contact development in the United States, or in the case of USA fellows, abroad.
- Provide citizens of the United States with opportunities to understand the aims, achievements, and problems of different countries through meeting proven young leaders of those countries; conversely, provide citizens in other nations the opportunity to meet rising U.S. leaders.
- Create and sustain a unique lifetime network of leaders whose ties to one another and to the United States may foster continued personal growth and understanding and that encourage peace, productivity and progress.

In February 2004, Eisenhower Fellowships hired the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning (OMG) to conduct an evaluation of their programs. This evaluation comes at an important time in the program’s history, following the 50th anniversary in 2003 and the appointment of a new EF President in 2004. EF has been operating for a significant number of years and has had the opportunity to create the kinds of impacts that deepen and strengthen over time. This is an opportunity to gather evidence of those impacts and to examine the strengths of the program as well as areas for improvement. By looking at the past, we hope that this assessment will help guide the Eisenhower Fellowships into a strong future.

OMG’s evaluation focused on discerning impacts that the program has had on fellows, and on their institutions and societies as well. It also looked at the activities of the EF staff in organizing and facilitating the program. Our evaluation approach consisted of the following methods:

- A review of EF materials and interviews with EF staff, trustees, and fellows leading to the creation of a “pathway map” documenting EF’s theory of change.
- In-depth case studies of 15 alumni to gather rich, detailed examples of program impacts.
- An online survey of all living alumni to collect a breadth of data on program experiences and outcomes.

This report presents the findings of all evaluation activities, as well as conclusions and recommendations for EF. We hope that this document provides a useful picture of the program’s effectiveness in realizing its stated objectives for trustees, current and potential donors, staff, and
fellows. We also hope that the research will yield useful lessons for the programming staff and those who maintain the Eisenhower Fellowships network on a day-to-day basis.

**Organization of this Report**

This report is organized into four parts. The first outlines the main elements of the evaluation and explains our methodology. The second presents EF’s pathway map and theory of change—or, how staff and stakeholders believe the program functions to create outcomes for fellows, their institutions, and societies. The third presents an analysis of findings based on the case studies and survey data. This analysis describes the types of outcomes and impacts that Eisenhower Fellowships is attaining as well as those that, while desired by EF staff and stakeholders, were less evident in the findings. We also outline fellows’ feedback concerning specific components of the EF experience—for example, orientation and mid-program retreat—and we discuss their suggestions for strengthening the program. In the fourth section, we provide summary conclusions and recommendations for moving forward.

The fifteen case studies that OMG completed are written up as vignettes, which are approximately four to six pages long each. Due to their length, we did not include the vignettes in this report, although we did include themes, summaries, and quotes from the case studies. Instead, we created a separate document containing all fifteen vignettes. This document is available from the Eisenhower Fellowships.
1. Evaluation Design and Methodology

For this assessment of EF’s program and impacts, OMG implemented a mixed method evaluation design that includes a combination of quantitative and qualitative research activities and participative sessions with EF staff. This combination of methods was selected in order to allow OMG to collect *in-depth* information about fellows’ EF experiences and outcomes, as well as a *breadth* of data about the experiences of many fellows. The specific components of the evaluation and their methodologies are described below.

**Pathway Mapping**

OMG engaged EF staff and stakeholders in a process called pathway mapping, which is designed to articulate the logic and understanding about how a program works (also called the program’s theory of change). Pathway mapping documents a program’s activities (or inputs), as well as the types of outcomes or impacts that the program *should* lead to, if it is functioning as intended. The pathway mapping process also captures the logical connections (or pathways) that are believed to exist between the program’s activities and outcomes, and the timeline along which the development of the outcomes should occur. The result of this process is a document called a pathway map, which is similar to a flowchart and shows the connections that are believed to exist between the program’s activities and outcomes.

OMG’s methodology for creating the Eisenhower Fellowships pathway map combined a review of written documents about the program—including the EF website—with a series of group interviews of key Eisenhower staff. We also interviewed Eisenhower Fellowships former President Adrian Basora, observed a seminar session during EF orientation, and conducted telephone interviews with five trustees and three alumni. Appendix A lists the trustees and fellows who were interviewed for this purpose. Following these activities, OMG drafted a pathway map and reviewed and revised the document together with EF staff.

**Case Studies**

The case study component of OMG’s evaluation work was designed to capture in-depth snapshots of the experiences of 15 fellows who have participated in EF since 1989. Due to the high degree of variation across Eisenhower Fellowships—for example, EF has three distinct programs, operates on several different continents, and selects a diversity of fellows from different fields, backgrounds and age groups—it was important for the case studies to feature the widest variety of fellows possible in a sample of fifteen. Thus we selected our case study sample using random sampling within particular categories to insure that we would have a mix of fellows from different continents, EF programs, fields, and genders.

The primary characteristics used to select the sample were EF program and fellows’ continent of origin. Using Microsoft Excel, fellows were sorted into EF program and continent categories. OMG randomly selected fifteen fellows in a manner that maximized the variety among the categories. We then examined the balance within the sample along the following characteristics: gender, year of fellowship, professional field, and availability of contact information including an

---

3 At the time of the interview, Adrian Basora was the President of Eisenhower Fellowships. Mr. Basora was replaced as EF President by John Wolf in August 2004.
email address. A few replacements were made to the sample in cases when researchers attempted to contact fellows but were unable to reach them after several tries.

Telephone interviews and a review of fellows’ EF itineraries and final reports were the main data sources for the case studies. For each sample member, we attempted to conduct telephone interviews with the fellow and two key informants—usually colleagues or friends who were knowledgeable about the fellow’s work and accomplishments from the time before the fellowship to the present. The use of multiple perspectives was intended to increase the strength of the case study design by offering differing points of view concerning each fellow and the impacts of their fellowship experience. However, despite our repeated efforts at contacting key informants, it was not always possible to interview two key informants. Two case studies include interviews with only one key informant, and three include no informants.

The data from interviews was used to craft vignettes describing the fellows’ EF experiences and impacts that the program has had on their lives, work, and larger societies. In addition, we cross-analyzed all case studies to examine the frequency of different types of outcomes.

Case study interview guides are included as Appendix B to this report.

**Alumni Survey**

OMG conducted an online survey of all living EF alumni. This evaluation component was designed to provide a breadth of data indicating the types of impacts experienced by many alumni, whereas the case studies give an in-depth description of outcomes experienced by a smaller number of participants.

The survey instrument (attached as Appendix C) included 23 close-ended questions and four open-ended questions on key issues including the most significant outcomes of the experience and suggestions for program improvement. EF offered an incentive for fellows to complete the survey—all survey respondents were entered into a random drawing to receive free registration to the next EF conference in Singapore in June 2005. Three prize-winners were drawn once the survey was completed on September 3rd.

The online survey was launched on July 20, 2004 and was fielded for approximately six weeks. Email messages announcing the survey were sent to 938 fellows (although 153 bounced back), and 331 fellows who do not have email addresses were sent hardcopy surveys in the mail. The survey was also announced in the EF newsletter, and email reminders were sent to fellows on August 10th, 23rd, and 30th. Three hundred ninety nine (399) fellows responded to some but not all of the survey online, 382 fellows completed the survey online, and 47 mailed hard-copy surveys to OMG. Altogether, this represents a response rate of 40% and a completion rate of 38%. OMG analyzed the close-ended results using the statistical software package, SPSS. Codes were developed for the open-ended questions and responses were analyzed manually.

---

4 Therefore, the total number of fellows who received mail regarding the survey is 1116.
Description of Survey Respondents

Of the fellows who responded to the survey, 64% were MNP fellows, 20% were SNP/SRP fellows, and 16% were USA fellows (see Figure 1.1). As seen in Figure 1.2, almost half (47%) of the survey respondents participated in EF during the past nine years, since 1995. Another quarter (26%) participated between 1985 and 1994, and 12% were fellows between 1975 and 1984. Fifteen (15) percent of respondents were fellows before 1975, including some respondents who participated as early as 1955. The average age of respondents when they participated in the program was 41.

Figure 1.1

![Survey Respondents by EF Program](image)

Figure 1.2

![Year of EF Participation of Survey Respondents](image)

Most (78%) survey respondents were male, and most (71%) brought their spouses with them for at least part of the fellowship. In terms of their fields of work (see Figure 1.3), the largest representation was in the educational field (10%), followed by politics and government (9%), communications media (8%), law (7%), and business (7%). It should be noted that fellows were asked to select their field from a list of possibilities, and their career may not have been precisely described by any of the available options. Also, the survey did not ask what sector fellows

*Eisenhower Fellowships*  
*Final Evaluation Report*
worked in at the time of their fellowship; therefore, we are unable to report how many fellows work for non-profit organizations, government agencies, or private companies.

**Figure 1.3**

![Bar chart showing the most common fields of work among survey respondents.](chart)

The fellows from the MNP and SNP/SRP programs represented a variety of countries (see Figure 1.4). Thirty-seven (37) percent were from countries in Europe, 26% were from Asia, 16% were from South America, 6% each were from the Middle East, Africa, and North America, and 3% were from Oceania (Australia and New Zealand). Similarly, the USA fellows were from a range of states (see Figure 1.5). Twenty-three (23) percent were from Pennsylvania, 16% were from North Carolina, 7% were from Massachusetts and New York, and 6% were from California. In terms of race/ethnicity, 86% of USA fellows responding to the survey were white (non-Hispanic).

**Figure 1.4**

![Pie chart showing the international survey respondents' home countries.](chart)
Figure 1.5

Most Common States of Residence among USA Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Eisenhower Fellowships’ Pathway Map

The first research activity that OMG conducted for the Eisenhower Fellowships was pathway-mapping. Pathway mapping engages the staff and stakeholders of a program in structured discussions designed to articulate their logic and understanding about how the program works, which is also called the program’s theory of change. The result of the process is a document called a pathway map, which represents the theory of change by showing the connections that are believed to exist between the program’s activities and outcomes.

One of the challenges in creating a pathway map for EF was the fact that EF consists of three separate programs, which are similar but have distinctive characteristics. However, EF staff indicated that they believe the logic and desired outcomes of the three programs are essentially the same. Therefore, it was decided that OMG would create one pathway map that presented the logic behind all three programs, and would footnote those parts of the pathway map that deal with specific aspects of programs. Another challenge for OMG was the fact that EF was created more than 50 years ago and has changed and grown dramatically since its inception. We focused on capturing the logic and assumptions behind the program as it exists today because we believe that the pathway map will be more useful if it reflects the current programming.

Eisenhower Fellowships’ Theory of Change

The Eisenhower Fellowships was created in 1953 in honor of President Dwight D. Eisenhower as a means of promoting international understanding and peace through the exchange of information, ideas, and perspectives among emerging leaders from different countries. There are several key activities, or inputs, which EF staff and stakeholders perform in order to facilitate the program (see page 15). Among these are the strategic selection of countries or regions that will participate in the program, and the nomination and selection of fellows from those areas. EF’s strategy is to select tomorrow’s leaders—or, individuals who will be highly influential—from areas of the world that are of key importance.

Once selected, the fellows embark on an Eisenhower Fellowship experience of approximately two months of travel according to an individualized itinerary. The itineraries are comprised mainly of appointments with high-level professionals in the fellows’ fields of interest, and sometimes include site visits, conferences, or group meetings. EF staff work closely with fellows to plan the itineraries, and trustees and other stakeholders help to arrange appointments with professionals in the fellows’ fields and home hospitality with former EFs. For international fellows coming to the U.S., the program also includes seminars with a cohort of fellows from a variety of professional fields and locations. The cohort participates in sessions such as an orientation to the U.S. and to EF, a mid-program retreat, and a closing seminar with presentations and discussions of each fellow’s travel experience and meetings.

USA fellows have a briefer orientation and their EF experience does not include a strong cohort component.
NOMINATING AND SELECTING FELLOWS
- Selection criteria conveying clear standards
- Diverse in-country nominating committees, including EF alumni, rigorously applying selection criteria
- Final selection by EF staff (Philadelphia) with input of trustees

PROGRAM PLANNING
- Fellows identify their interests
- Fellows and program officers plan individual itineraries with participation from trustees, alumni, professional contacts, etc.

ALUMNI RESOURCES AND NETWORK
- Intra-Ike
  - Directory of fellows
  - Discussion forums
- Hosting and meeting with current fellows or alumni fellows visiting country
- Country-wide associations of alumni
- Conferences
- Ongoing communications and stewardship via EF (newsletters, web-news, reports, messages from the president, etc.)
- Hosting and meeting with trustees and PAC members visiting country

FELLOWSHIP EXPERIENCE
- EF Seminars*
  - Orientation to the U.S., EF, and leadership issues
  - Presentation by an EF Trustee or PAC member who is a prominent foreign policy expert
  - Oral presentation and written report
  - Discussions and networking with cohort of fellows from other areas and fields
  - Introduction to the EF network
- Travel and individualized itineraries
  - Appointments with leaders in field and related fields
  - Frequent access to high-level contacts
  - Group meetings
  - Conferences and seminars
  - Site visits
  - Exposure to broader EF network
- Spousal participation
- Discussions and networking with trustees, PAC members, and sponsors

*Duration and content of EF seminars varies between the MNP/SRP and USA programs
The EF network is considered to be a key component of the program. Staff and stakeholders stress that EF is a life-long experience, not one that ends when fellows return home. Ongoing participation in EF may take many forms, including relationships, friendships, and collaborations with other fellows or with professional contacts from the country visited; participation in country-wide EF associations and nominating committees; attendance at EF meetings and conferences; and hosting fellows who are visiting the country. While many of these activities are initiated by fellows, EF facilitates some ongoing communications and stewardship via newsletters, reports, an online directory of fellows, and online discussion forums. Staff also plan and host some meetings—for example, the 50th Anniversary meeting held in Philadelphia in 2003.

The EF theory of change hinges upon the notion that the program identifies individuals from around the world who will be influential in the future, and intensifies or strengthens their potential impact through the fellowship experience and via access to the EF network and relationships.

**Key Assumptions**

During the pathway mapping process, OMG identified several key assumptions or beliefs that are shared by many EF staff and stakeholders and upon which the program is based. These are not program activities *per se* but are critical to document because they influence the success of the program. These assumptions are:

- **EF selects “the right people” to become fellows,** and the program’s success is closely tied to the selection process. Key assumptions regarding the fellows include:
  - Those selected as fellows have already demonstrated leadership potential as well as significant accomplishments in their professional fields. The EF experience is designed to *strengthen* their potential significantly, but it is likely that fellows would become influential even without the program.
  - Fellows are altruistic and are interested in working towards progress that benefits those around them (the larger society), not only themselves. Thus, what they gain during the fellowships will be applied to the “greater benefit” of society.

- **The learning that occurs during EF is experiential learning and happens mainly through exposure to different people and viewpoints.** There is no Eisenhower curriculum and EF is not intended as a skill-building program. Rather, learning takes the form of broadening fellows’ viewpoints and providing new and useful perspectives and frameworks. This occurs when fellows meet with each other, with professionals in their fields and other fields, and with other contacts in the country visited. With these people, they exchange ideas, experiences, and best practices and may agree to collaborate on future endeavors for mutual benefit. This experience also involves the development of a greater understanding of the host country’s culture and society.

- **Leadership is understood differently across various cultures** and the program does not support one definition of leadership over others. However, it does seek to heighten fellows’ awareness of themselves as leaders and their comfort in assuming leadership roles. Many staff and trustees believe that two key aspects of leadership that the program helps develop are *self-confidence* and *motivation.* They believe that this happens experientially—throughout the fellows’ travel experiences and interviews with high-level professionals. For international fellows, EF conducts a half-day leadership seminar.
during orientation, when fellows discuss definitions and characteristics of leadership. This seminar helps frame issues of leadership with the expectation that the fellows—on their own—will continue to reflect on these issues during and after the EF experience.

- **Access to new and high-level contacts will help propel fellows to a new professional level.** By arranging appointments between fellows and high-level professionals in another country, and providing a cohort of similarly qualified fellows, the program provides fellows with access to a new and high-caliber network of professional contacts. With effort and maintenance, these relationships may lead to future collaborations, business ventures, programs, and partnerships, as well as to a larger field of influence.

**Impacts and Desired Outcomes**

The outcomes identified by EF staff, trustees, and fellows during the pathway mapping process are shown on page 18. We have categorized the outcomes into three categories: individual-level, organizational-level, and societal-level. Concerning individual-level changes, one would expect that if EF were successful, a fellow would experience changes in his/her personal self. For example, the fellow may develop a better understanding of the U.S. (or the country visited, for USA fellows) and gain a greater appreciation of American history, government, and culture. Or, the fellow’s perspective may be broadened by seeing how his/her professional field operates in a different country. It is hoped that these types of individual-level changes will be a foundation leading to the development of outcomes that go beyond the personal level to affect others.

In the organizational-level category, the fellow is sharing and/or applying the learning gained during EF to his/her work, career track, network, and organization; and with friends, family, and colleagues. For example, during a strategy meeting with colleagues, an international fellow involved in educational issues may give a presentation about best practices or models concerning charter schools and privatization practices in the U.S. based on his/her fellowship experience.

Finally, the societal-level outcomes category is for definite, tangible impacts such as new programs, policies, institutions, systems of operation and management, etc. These outcomes often occur as a result of strategic collaborations and have benefits for people other than the fellow and his/her immediate colleagues, family, and friends. Following the previous example, a societal-level outcome would occur if the town or county’s educational department decided to model its new school system on the example shared by the EF fellow during the presentation.

The arrows on page 12 indicate the general belief among EF staff and stakeholders that individual-level changes are most likely to develop first and to lead to organizational-level and societal-level outcomes. However, there is also a recognition that outcomes develop differently among different fellows; therefore, the categories are not meant to correspond with specific time periods or to suggest that one category is more important than the rest. In addition, it is not expected that every fellow will experience all of the types of changes denoted. Finally, it is important to point out that since fellows were already promising professionals with demonstrated leadership potential before EF (as discussed previously), some outcomes are not due—or not entirely due—to the EF experience. The impact, “fellows make more and deeper impacts in current or new professional fields,” indicates that through the EF experience, it is expected that fellows’ contributions and accomplishments in life will be heightened.
EISENHOWER FELLOWSHIPS
PROGRAM OUTCOMES

INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL
- Broadened perspective
- Enhanced professional knowledge
- Improved leadership awareness and capacity, including:
  - Self-confidence
  - Assertion of leadership
  - Recognition of leadership by others
  - Motivation
- New relationships, networks, and alliances with:
  - Professional contacts, often high level, from U.S. (or country visited)
  - Fellows in cohort
  - EF alumni
  - EF staff, trustees, PAC and sponsors
- Heightened cross-cultural and international perspective
- More comprehensive understanding of the U.S. and its key institutions (or of the country visited, for USA program)

ORGANIZATIONAL-LEVEL
- Application of broader perspective and/or knowledge gained during EF to work in current or new fields
- Assuming positions of greater influence and scope; exerting more effective leadership
- Strong personal and professional networks
- Strong EF network
- Ongoing relationships, communication, and partnerships with contacts from U.S., fellows in cohort, EF alumni, country associations, etc.
- Sharing knowledge and perspective gained during fellowship with others
- Improvements or growth in fellows’ organizations and institutions

SOCIETAL-LEVEL
- Fellows make more and deeper impacts in current or new professional fields
- Fellows develop strategic collaborations that result in new and/or improved activities, programs, or institutions, with benefits extending to a broader constituency

IDEAL
- Progress and advancements that benefit society
- Greater mutual understanding and peace
Finally, we have included on the pathway map some ideal outcomes, which EF staff and stakeholders hope the program contributes to. These ideal outcomes are also reflected in the mission statement of the fellowships. We have placed them in an “ideal” category because it is beyond the scope of the evaluation—of any evaluation—to measure them in absolute terms; it would be even more difficult to attribute these types of world outcomes to Eisenhower Fellowships. However, we believe that in depicting EF’s theory of change, it is important to include those ideals that the program hopes to contribute to.

On page 21, we have combined the inputs and outcomes that we have described to create EF’s pathway map. The map presents a framework for how the program’s staff and stakeholders believe that it should function.

Other Themes from Interviews with Program Stakeholders

In addition to interviewing EF trustees and fellows about program activities, assumptions, and desired impacts, OMG spoke with interviewees about issues including the future of the program, suggestions for improvement, and the value of the EF network. What follows are some key themes that emerged from those interviews.

- **Interviewees had different priorities and emphases when asked about the main goals and key outcomes of EF.** For example, some see EF primarily as a leadership development program, while others see it first and foremost as a professional development experience. Some told us that the main goal of the program is to strengthen democratic values and enhance fellows’ understanding of the U.S., its society and culture. Others said that the purpose of EF is to build an international network of leaders to promote friendlier relations among countries at critical points in the future. None of the interviewees’ main goals for EF were contradictory; however, they reflect varying priorities for the program. These differences may affect program planning and decision-making processes. It should be noted that the variance in emphases extended through to the staff and President of EF, as well.

- **Many interviewees believe that effective learning occurs through experience and by challenging individuals, not via “classroom learning” or explicit academic models.** One trustee used a fishing metaphor to describe the difference between these two styles of learning. If a fisherman splashes loudly down into a stream and announces he’s there, the fish will disappear; but if he gently casts his line into the water and challenges the fish with his bait, they will slowly rise to the surface. Many interviewees believe that EF should present fellows with challenges and opportunities, and that the fellows will meet these challenges according to the extent of their abilities.

- **Trustees were uncertain about the strength and level of activity of the EF network.** They have heard that network activity varies in different countries and they understand that a global network is difficult to maintain. However, they are unsure whether the EF network is effective overall, and if so, to what extent and what end(s). Some interviewees feel that EF should be more proactive at facilitating network activities if this is to be a key aspect of the program. This topic is discussed further throughout the report and in the Conclusions and Recommendations section.

---

6 Adrian Basora was the EF President at the time OMG conducted these interviews.
• Concerning the future of EF, trustees’ suggestions for program improvement included increasing the visibility of EF, and expanding or enlarging the program. Trustees felt that very few people know about EF, and they would like to see this change. Some believe that EF is starting to pay greater attention to the issue of program visibility. Concerning program expansion, some trustees expressed hopes that EF will add another cohort of fellows to the program each year. Their concern was that, given the global nature of the program, the current level of activity does not allow the program to amass enough fellows in specific areas so that the synergy among them leads to additional momentum and ongoing impacts.
Broadened perspective
Enhanced professional knowledge
Improved leadership awareness and capacity, including:
- Self-confidence
- Assertion of leadership
- Recognition of leadership by others
- Motivation
New relationships, networks, and alliances with:
- Professional contacts, often high level, from U.S. (or country visited)
- Fellows in cohort
- EF alumni
- EF staff, trustees, PAC and sponsors
Heightened cross-cultural and international perspective
More comprehensive understanding of the U.S. and its key institutions (or of the country visited, for USA program)

Application of broader perspective and/or knowledge gained during EF to work in current or new fields
Assuming positions of greater influence and scope; exerting more effective leadership
Strong personal and professional networks
Strong EF network
Ongoing relationships, communication, and partnerships with contacts from U.S., fellows in cohort, EF alumni, country associations, etc.
Sharing knowledge and perspective gained during fellowship with others
Improvements or growth in fellows’ organizations and institutions
Fellows make more and deeper impacts in current or new professional fields
Fellows develop strategic collaborations that result in new and/or improved activities, programs or institutions, with benefits extending to a broader constituency

Program Planning (with involvement of fellows and EF staff and stakeholders)
Fellowship Experience:
- EF seminars
- Travel and itineraries
- Spousal participation
Alumni Resources and Network:
- Intra-Ike directory and forums
- Country alumni associations
- Conferences
- Ongoing communications
- Hosting and meeting with fellows, alumni, and others involved with EF
Nominating and selecting fellows

Individually

Organizationally

Societally

Ideal

Prograrn Activities / Inputs

Outcomes
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3. Findings Related to Program Activities and Outcomes

In this section of the report, we describe the key findings of the evaluation, which are based on the online survey as well as a cross analysis of the 15 case studies. The quotes interspersed throughout the text in boxes are from the case studies, while the quotes used within the text in italics are from the survey. First, we present findings related to the outcomes or effects of EF. Second, we discuss findings related to specific EF activities. Finally, we describe comments and suggestions that fellows provided for strengthening the program.

Outcomes

The evaluation findings show that Eisenhower Fellowships is a powerful experience that has positive effects on fellows’ personal and professional lives. When asked to rate the program’s overall effects on their development, fellows responding to OMG’s survey gave the experience a very high score of 3.7 on a scale from 0 (an extremely negative experience) to 4 (an extremely positive experience). The case studies provide further proof that EF is a powerful, and oftentimes transformative, experience. Nearly all fellows profiled in case studies were very positive about EF overall. Even the few that were slightly less positive overall admitted that the fellowship had influenced their thinking and awareness of certain issues.

Survey data show that EF contributes strongly to individual-level outcomes for most fellows (see Figure 3.1 on the next page). Specifically, eighty-one (81) percent of respondents said that the program had a moderate to strong effect on all of the following: their professional knowledge, international perspective, understanding of the U.S. (or country visited), ideas and plans for their work, personal and professional goals, self-confidence, their ideas about leadership, and their perception of themselves as a leader.

Fifty-seven (57) percent of the fellows also reported organizational-level outcomes as a result of their fellowship experience. In particular, these respondents said that EF had led to changes in their organizations or institutions. Societal-level outcomes were difficult to attribute solely or directly to the program, but about half (51%) of the survey respondents said that EF had led to strategic collaborations resulting in new programs, policies, organizations or institutions.

The case studies lend further support to the overall finding that EF contributes strongly to individual-level outcomes, and that it contributes moderately to organizational-level and societal-level outcomes. Both the fellows who were interviewed for case studies and their key informants described how the experiences and contacts gained during EF led to personal and professional changes.

---

7 This (3.7) rating is the average out of all the ratings given by individual survey respondents.
OMG repeated the analysis presented in Figure 3.1 four times, looking for differences in outcomes among various groups of survey respondents. Specifically, we looked for differences in outcomes according to the EF program that fellows participated in (MNP, SNP/SRP, or USA), fellows’ age at the time of the fellowship, their year of participation, and gender. While some interesting patterns did emerge from this analysis, there was only one instance in which differences were statistically significant. However, in the discussion below, we include all patterns that are consistent or appear to be large, even though we cannot be certain that these differences are not due to chance.

The most noticeable pattern that emerged from these sub-analyses was the one corresponding with EF program (see Figure 3.2 on the next page). USA fellows reported weaker outcomes as a result of their fellowship than fellows in the international programs, and SNP/SRP fellows reported the strongest effects. These differences were consistent across individual-level, organizational-level, and societal-level outcomes, but were statistically significant only for societal-level outcomes.

The USA program is unique among the three EF programs—it is the most recent as well as the smallest program in terms of cohort size, and the cohort meets less frequently and less intensively than cohorts in the MNP and SNP/SRP programs. USA fellows generally travel for a shorter period of time as well. The Single Nation/Single Region program is unique in that cohort members are from the same area, may share language and cultural similarities, and may be able to

---

8 Throughout this report, “statistically significant” results are those that we are at least 95% certain are not due to chance. While many of the differences that we discuss in this report were not “statistically significant”, they do represent notable findings and trends.
more easily maintain communication with each other following the program. These programmatic differences may account for some of the differences in fellows’ ratings of program outcomes. These issues will be discussed further throughout the report.

Figure 3.2

![Bar chart showing the percentage of fellows attributing individual-level, organizational-level, and societal-level outcomes to their fellowship by program.](chart)

**Societal-level differences are statistically significant**

There was also some variation in outcomes according to fellows’ age at the time of the fellowship (Figure 3.3). Those who were over 45 during EF reported more organizational-level and societal-level outcomes than younger fellows. However, this pattern is not consistent for individual-level program effects. In fact, older fellows reported the fewest individual-level outcomes, although the difference was not large. The difference in results for individual-level outcomes suggests that older fellows are more mature when they enter the program and therefore have less to gain in terms of personal development.
One might expect to find differences in outcomes according to program year, since the fellowship has undergone design changes throughout its history (for example, the length of the fellowship has become dramatically shorter over time). However, fellows from all years reported similar levels of individual outcomes, suggesting that design changes have not affected the program’s success in influencing fellows’ personal development (see Figure 3.4). Societal-level outcomes follow a clearer pattern: fellows that participated before 1985 were more likely to report societal-level outcomes than recent fellows. However, this probably reflects the fact that societal-level impacts require time to develop, and fellows who participated in EF recently have not had adequate time to attain these types of impacts.
Finally, the analysis according to gender shows similar levels of individual outcomes for males and females (see Figure 3.5 on the next page). However, males reported slightly more organizational-level and societal-level outcomes than females. Again, these differences are not statistically significant and may be due to chance. However, they may also reflect that fewer females hold positions of power in their organizations, or the heightened challenges for females who attempt to lead and transform organizations, due to societal and cultural prejudices.
Throughout the remainder of the Findings section, we discuss all noticeable patterns that exist within the data, by survey item. By noticeable patterns, we mean those that appear to be large or consistent, or those that are statistically significant (significant results are noted). For example, if there are noticeable differences in the responses of males and females to a survey question, then those differences are discussed. If we do not mention any differences in relation to a particular item, then no pattern exists.

**Individual-level Outcomes**

There is very strong evidence that Eisenhower Fellowships contributes to the individual-level outcomes articulated in the EF pathway map (which was discussed in Section 2 of the report). These outcomes are: broadened perspective, enhanced professional knowledge, improved leadership awareness and capacity (including self-confidence and motivation), new relationships and networks, heightened cross-cultural and international perspective, and a more comprehensive understanding of the U.S. and its culture and institutions (or of the country visited, for USA fellows). When asked to describe the most significant effects of EF on their lives and work, fellows’ open-ended survey responses indicated that individual-level changes were among the most powerful effects of the program overall (see Table 3.1).

While the evidence for individual-level impacts is strong overall, the data also suggest that EF contributes more strongly to some personal changes than to others (see Figure 3.6). Survey data and case studies both reflect that EF contributes very strongly to a heightening of fellows’ international perspectives and to gaining a better understanding of the U.S. (or country visited). In contrast, there was slightly less evidence of improved leadership awareness and perception of one’s self as a leader.

---

9 The survey question on which Figure 3.6 is based did not ask fellows about the formation of new relationships and networks as a result of EF. Networks were included in a different section of the survey and will be discussed separately in this report.
Table 3.1
Survey Item: “Describe the most significant effects your fellowship had on you and/or your career”

Responses were Coded into the Following Categories: % of Respondents
Provided access to important new relationships, networks 25%
Enhanced or increased my professional knowledge 23%
Improved/increased my cross culture and international perspective 23%
Improved/increased my understanding of the U.S. (or country visited), its culture and institutions 18%
Broadened/widened my perspective 13%
Improved/increased my self-confidence 10%
Made me recognize myself as a leader and/or more willing to assume leadership roles 7%
Provided motivation/inspiration 7%
Led to changes in my organization 7%
Led to a change in scope of my work, or a change in professions or organizations 6%
No effect 6%
(Vague, broad, or ambiguous responses) 6%
Led others to recognize me as a leader/ recognition, prestige 4%
Helped me to identify or clarify my goals, or improved my self-awareness 4%
Other 10%

N=408 respondents (some answers corresponded with more than one response category, thus the total of all percentages exceeds 100)

Figure 3.6
Fellows’ Ratings of Individual-Level Outcomes
Survey Question: “To what extent did EF enhance your…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional knowledge</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International perspective</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the [country]</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/plans for your work</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas about leadership</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of yourself as a leader</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with the pattern described previously (see page 23 and Figure 3.2), USA fellows reported fewer individual-level outcomes than international fellows across most indicators, and SNP/SRP fellows reported the strongest outcomes (see Figure 3.7). There was one notable exception to this pattern, which will be discussed below.

**Figure 3.7**

Fellows' Ratings of Selected Impacts (by Program)

Survey Question: "To what extent did EF enhance your..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional knowledge?</th>
<th>Ideas and plans for your work?</th>
<th>Personal and/or professional goals?</th>
<th>Self-confidence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To frame the discussion that follows, it is important to note that many individual-level outcomes are closely related to each other, and the effects of EF on specific outcomes are difficult to separate from one another. For example, it is often through a new relationship that broadened perspectives or enhanced professional knowledge is gained. And, in many cases, professional knowledge such as the awareness of a new way to do work is a broadening of perspective. Therefore, our discussion of personal outcomes is organized around clusters of outcomes as opposed to individual outcomes. In addition, the formation of new relationships and networks is not discussed in this section but is included with organizational-level outcomes. This is because virtually all fellows form new relationships, but it is the maintenance and use of the relationships and networks that EF is interested in, and this is an organizational-level outcome.

**International Perspective and Understanding of the Country Visited**

The evaluation findings indicate that EF leads directly to fellows developing heightened international perspectives and an enhanced understanding of the country visited. The key fellowship activity—an extended period of travel and meetings in a foreign country—contributes directly to these goals. For fellows profiled in case studies, EF was an opportunity to gain unique insight into a different culture. In interviews, some of the MNP fellows spoke about their new understanding and appreciation for the American way of life, or as one fellow summarized it, “American pragmatism.” According to another fellow, EF was a first-hand opportunity to “observe and understand the spirit of the American economy and to gain a unique understanding of the free market.” Overall, the international fellows (MNP and SNP/SRP participants) felt that
EF gave them an opportunity to observe and comprehend American culture in a way that would be impossible through books, the Internet, and media. The same observation was made by USA fellows about the country (or countries) that they visited.

In addition to the travel experience, other aspects of EF contribute to increased international and cross-cultural perspective. For example, the MNP participants featured in case studies expressed that their interactions with a global cohort of fellows was a unique aspect of the program that increased their awareness of issues of international concern and opened their eyes to the circumstances of others around the world. They valued speaking in-depth with other fellows on topics of common interest, and these personal conversations not only contributed to their understanding of global opinions, but also inspired them to view their work through an international lens. In addition, the cohort experience in the SNP/SRP program includes a group of professionals from various areas of a country or region. Survey respondents from both the MNP and SNP/SRP programs rated the meetings and discussions with their cohort as a “very valuable” aspect of the fellowship.

In survey results, USA fellows were more likely than international fellows to report that EF had contributed to heightened international perspectives and an increased understanding of the country visited (see Figure 3.8 on the next page). This is notable for two reasons. First, USA fellows rated other outcomes less strongly than international fellows, and these outcomes were the only exceptions to that pattern. Second, the international cohort experience that exists in the MNP and SNP/SRP programs, and which was highly valued by those fellows, does not exist in the USA program. It was only recently that EF added any cohort component to the USA fellowship experience, and the cohort is regional as opposed to international. Furthermore, the USA cohort does not meet during the fellowship because USA fellows generally do not travel to the same countries.

The case studies suggest that USA fellows are experiencing cross-cultural/international learning through an increased understanding of globalization and the role of the United States in the globalizing world. USA fellows interviewed for case studies talked a lot about foreign perceptions of Americans and how their fellowship had contributed to an increased awareness of those perceptions. It is also possible that USA fellows have traveled abroad less often or less intensively than international fellows prior to their EF experience. If this is true, then USA fellows may have more to gain in terms of enhancing their global and cross-cultural perspectives.
Broadened or Enhanced Professional Knowledge

The fellowship experience has a strong impact on fellows’ professional lives, including broadening their knowledge and ideas about their field, giving them specific information about how work is done in other countries (including policies, models and strategies), and prompting new ideas and plans for their work.

A majority of fellows profiled in case studies returned home from their fellowships with knowledge of new models, approaches, and specific tools to apply in their work. They collected cutting-edge information and methodologies, and explored new management styles, approaches to conflict resolution, lobbying and advocacy, and networking. Fellows’ responses to the open-ended survey item, “Please describe the most significant effects that your fellowship had on you and/or your career,” also shed light onto ways in which EF enhances fellows’ professional knowledge:

“At that time [before the fellowship], I only addressed women’s issues from the lens of economic development – better jobs and better wages. I [had] never thought about women’s political rights.” –MNP fellow

Observing a best practice firsthand in another country helped set a new standard for my expectations within my profession.

As a government official in charge of national development...EF has given me the opportunity to understand the economic policy of the U.S. government and the role of cooperatives in a capitalistic environment much better.
Also, because the EF experience provides participants with a broader international perspective, some fellows consequently change their professional and/or personal goals. For example, one survey respondent said:

It provided me with new goals and better vision of the old ones, and with ideas/tools as well as with self-confidence to accomplish them.

Importantly, this fellow credits EF not only with changing his/her goals, but also with providing the tools (knowledge and self-confidence) necessary to achieve the new ones.

Some survey respondents credited EF with giving them inspiration and motivation to carry on in their current work. For example:

I feel that what I have been doing can really contribute to human society and I am confident that I must continue despite some obstacles.

Case studies show that the program also re-invigorates many fellows. In many instances, it is apparent that the experiential nature of the fellowship helps to maximize fellows’ renewal. One fellow featured in a case study reflected that, “The distinction that I would make is that the Fellowship allowed me to create possibilities for success that never existed before.” On his fellowship, this alumnus witnessed government reforms functioning better than he’d ever realized was possible, and this allowed him to set his goals at a new level. Even though he’d read about the reforms previously, nothing could compare with experiencing them first-hand on his fellowship. He added, “For a couple of weeks, I was like a kid at a candy store. It was just unbelievable to me that I would actually see in reality what I had been attempting to implement.”

**Improved Leadership Awareness and Capacity**

EF staff believe that critical dimensions of leadership awareness and capacity include self-confidence, critical thinking about leadership, and an awareness of one’s self as a leader. Survey data reflect that the fellowship contributes to all three; however, it appears to contribute more strongly to self-confidence than it does to fellows’ ideas about leadership or their perceptions of themselves as leaders.

In case studies, increased confidence was characterized by fellows’ new approaches to implementing change, willingness to take risks, and the extent to which they challenged others’ viewpoints. In some open-ended survey responses, fellows explained that confidence was developed by interacting with a wide variety of people—including experts and leaders—from different cultures.

The fellowship gave me the confidence to interface with persons at all levels, often at short notice.

For me this trip was an eye-opener in many respects. I "grew" in many directions. My self-confidence soared and touched new heights. I discovered strengths within my self that I never knew existed. I interacted with intelligent and prospective leaders from different [countries].

The data also provide some examples of fellows recognizing themselves as leaders and being recognized by others, as a result of EF. A fellow interviewed for a case study said, “The fact that
such a prestigious organization wanted to attach their name to mine was a sign that what I was doing was important – it was good to know that the effort was being noticed.”

It is clear that fellows have differing views of leadership—often fueled by customs and cultural diversity. Therefore, it is not surprising that fellows from some continents (South America, in particular) rated EF much higher for contributing to their leadership capacity and awareness than fellows from other countries (especially Europe) on the survey (Figure 3.9). Also, while men tended to rate EF higher than women in terms of most fellowship outcomes, leadership development was different; women rated EF higher along leadership dimensions than men did (Figure 3.10). These types of differences may relate to the fact that fellows enter the program with different levels of leadership capacity and therefore have more or less to gain from the experience. In addition, different groups may have had their leadership recognized or praised to different extents in the past.

Figure 3.9

![Leadership Outcomes by Continent](chart1)

Figure 3.10

![Leadership Outcomes by Gender](chart2)

In a case study, one fellow hypothesized that fellows may gain more or less in self-confidence and leadership skills according to their level of professional experience entering the program. She said, “I was one of the oldest fellows, past the difficult part of my career, I was already well established. For younger people the experience may contribute to their self-confidence and risk taking, [but] I had taken all of my risks. For me –

10 Fellows from South America tended to rate EF higher in terms of many outcomes than fellows from other continents; however, the difference in scores for leadership outcomes was particularly noticeable.

11 Europe, Asia, and South America were the only continents included in the sub-analysis presented in Figure 3.9 because there were not enough survey respondents from other continents.

---
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the Fellowship yielded more assets and tools.” Other case studies lend some evidence to this theory, and while this trend was not evident in survey results according to age, OMG did not collect data that enable us to analyze results according to fellows’ level of establishment in their careers.

Organizational-level Outcomes

On the pathway map, organizational-level outcomes for the EF program relate to fellows sharing the knowledge and perspectives gained during the fellowship, and applying the learning to their lives and work in order to make improvements. Due to the wide variety of ways in which EF impacts fellows individually, organizational-level outcomes can take many different forms. These may include changes in professions or organizations; promotions or assuming positions of greater influence or leadership; the production of new materials or publications; and other applications of new ideas to work. In addition, maintaining and utilizing the relationships and networks gained via EF is an organizational-level outcome contributing to fellows’ having stronger personal and professional networks.

There is strong evidence that EF contributes to the development of organizational-level outcomes for many fellows. However, the evidence for these types of outcomes is not as powerful as it is for individual-level outcomes. It appears that for some fellows, the individual-level changes that occur as a result of EF do not develop into larger-level changes.

Sharing Knowledge and Perspectives

Many fellows interviewed for case studies stated that they had shared their learning with colleagues and peers upon their return home. Most of this sharing was done in informal settings and conversations, although a few fellows made public presentations and shared their experiences widely through published reports or, in one case, a newsletter issue.

Seven survey respondents mentioned that their fellowship had led directly to the production of new materials or publications. Specific examples include:

*Published 3 articles resulting from the exchange.*

*I expanded my contact in the US and I was able to produce more papers for international conferences.*

“When I finished my [EF] program, a lot of people asked me to give a seminar with them… I calculate more than 20 meetings… I was being invited to talk about what I learned in America...from the view of academics, and technologies, and also in industry.” —MNP fellow

“My office gave me formal leave to write about my fellowship experience. That got me started on writing in newspaper columns. I now do this on a regular basis.” —MNP fellow

12 The survey question did not directly ask fellows about publications or new materials produced as a result of EF, but was framed as an impact question.
Many of the case studies provide examples of fellows applying their fellowship learning to their work. Some used newly acquired techniques, methodologies, and models, which they replicated to suit their needs or their organization’s needs. As one case study fellow stated, “Sometimes I would say—I got this idea from X—we are going to adapt it and see how it works for us.” For some, it was not the professional knowledge but the broader perspective gained during EF that was applied to work. For example, some of the USA fellows profiled in case studies reported pursuing (or strengthening) an international dimension in their work as a result of the fellowship.

Not only did fellows try out their new ideas, but in many cases the application of their EF learning resulted in improvements in their organizations and institutions. More than half (57%) of survey respondents said that EF led directly to positive changes and/or growth in their organizations. Table 3.2 provides more information on the responses to an open-ended survey question asking fellows to describe organizational-level changes.

Table 3.2
Survey Item: How Did the Fellowship Contribute to Improvements in Your Organization or Institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses were Coded into the Following Categories</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in overall climate of organization, or in leadership/management style</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added or enhanced an international dimension to the work</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a new direction in work (including new products, services, interest area)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New contacts and partners for collaboration</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a new model or strategy</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved operations/effectiveness (financial systems, marketing, accountability)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vague, broad, or ambiguous responses)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started a new business or organization</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion/growth of business or organization</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Center or program established within current organization</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New policy introduced to organization (or to government, for government employees)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in mission</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too soon to know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=244 respondents (some answers corresponded with more than one response category, thus the total of all percentages exceeds 100)

13 Sixty-three (63) percent of respondents said “Yes” when asked if EF had led directly to any organizational or institutional changes; however, when asked to describe these changes, some described...
Changing Fields or Careers

Forty-one (41) percent of survey respondents reported having changed professions or fields since their fellowship. While it is easy to understand how the EF experience could contribute to career changes (as a result of broadened perspectives and re-aligned goals), one cannot assume that such changes are always positive. For example, one case study highlights the experience of a fellow who was forced to resign from his position and start another career sometime after he returned from his fellowship. This change was neither a positive experience nor a direct result of the fellowship. For this reason, we believe that the number of fellows changing fields should be viewed more as a descriptor than as an outcome. As a descriptor, it tells us that almost half of EF fellows are likely to change fields or careers sometime after their fellowship. This may be important for program planning purposes—for example, the program may want to consider whether the type of knowledge gained during the fellowship is broad enough to be useful across numerous fields, or if it is the type of knowledge that will be lost if fellows change careers.

We asked the fellows who reported having changed careers to rate the extent to which their fellowship had contributed to the change (on a scale from 0=did not contribute, to 4=contributed directly). On average, they said that their EF experience contributed moderately (a score of 2).

MNP and SNP/SRP fellows were much more likely than USA fellows to report a career change since EF (see Figure 3.11). Also, fewer fellows from Asia reported changing careers (28% for Asian fellows as opposed to 41% for all fellows).

![Figure 3.11 Percentage of Fellows Reporting Changes in their Field or Profession (by Program)](image)

Differences are statistically significant

---

changes that were actually individual level changes - such as increased self-confidence or knowledge. These were subtracted from the percentage claiming organizational level outcomes.
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Assuming Positions of Greater Scope or Influence

In contrast to career changes, fellows assuming positions of greater influence and scope can be seen as a positive outcome of EF. Assuming positions of greater scope could mean promotions or gaining greater leadership responsibilities or more direct input to policy and decision-making. This could occur within fellows’ current organizations or via new positions within different organizations. It could also occur via appointment to a decision-making body, nomination to a committee, or election to public office.

“It think one of the reasons he took the [new] job...was to hone his leadership skills, because here he was more of an administrator... He is allowed to be a leader over there.” —Key informant

It is difficult to determine the extent to which gaining positions of greater scope is affected by the fellowship experience or whether such gains are due mainly to natural career growth and progression. Survey respondents were asked to what extent EF had contributed directly to their assuming positions of greater scope or influence. On average, they said that EF had a “moderate” contribution (an average rating of 2 on a scale from 0=did not contribute, to 4=very strong contribution), meaning that the fellowship was a factor—but only one of several (see Figure 3.12). However, 45% of respondents said that EF contributed strongly or very strongly to their gaining positions of greater scope or influence. Similarly, most fellows interviewed for case studies believed that their career advancement was due partly to the newfound knowledge and skills gained during EF, or to increased confidence and leadership skills resulting from the fellowship. In one case study in particular, the EF experience contributed so much to the legitimacy of a fellow as a leader that his colleagues perceived him as an expert in American telecommunications. This perception led to multiple promotions culminating in a new position in the United States.

Survey Question: “To what Extent did EF Contribute to your gaining Positions of Greater Scope and Influence”

Respondents’ Choices

Eisenhower Fellowships
Final Evaluation Report
**Relationships and Networks**

While all fellows come into contact with a variety of new individuals during the fellowship experience, it is only with maintenance and effort that these relationships mature and contribute to larger goals. Survey and case study data indicate that some but not all fellows are maintaining their EF relationships. In addition, some fellows who have maintained EF relationships reported a variety of impressive partnerships and collaborative activities as a result. For example:

*Together with my fellow from Taiwan I organized the first visit of Romanian bankers to Taiwanese financial institutions and opened the relationship.*

*Development of my political party’s program for health care as a result of the many new contacts I got in the US (learning from what is good in the US as well as what is not as good)*...

*Joint master’s program between my university and US universities.*

*Contacts established during the fellowship subsequently yielded several international research projects in the field of diabetes.*

Through EF, fellows have the opportunity to form relationships with at least four different groups of people: fellows in their EF cohort; professionals they meet with in the country visited; EF staff, trustees, and President’s Advisory Council members; and EF alumni in their home country. When asked how often they currently have contact with each of these groups, less than a third of survey respondents characterized their level of contact with any one group as frequent (see Figure 3.13 on the next page).\(^1\) Slightly more fellows reported frequent contact with members of their EF cohort (22%) and alumni in their country (31%) than with the professionals they met abroad (9%) or EF staff and stakeholders (10%).

SNP/SRP fellows were more likely than others to report frequent contact with fellows from their cohort (42% of SNP/SRP fellows reported frequent contact with their cohort members as opposed to 22% of all fellows). Similarly, among those fellows profiled in case studies, the greatest connections occurred among the SNP/SRP participants. All of the SNP/SRP case study fellows said that they maintain some contact with their colleagues and the wider EF alumni network in their country, largely for business purposes or as committee members to nominate new Eisenhower Fellows. In one case study, an SNP/SRP fellow reported that his friendship with a colleague from his EF cohort has led to a business undertaking. The fact that relationships are strong among SNP/SRP fellows is not surprising given the likelihood of geographical proximity, shared language and ease of communications, and a common culture among the fellows.

---

\(^1\) Fellows were given three options to choose between to characterize their level of contact with the four different groups: never, occasional, and frequent.
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“I had great exposure to true cultural diversity and all of my experiences helped me realize that communication and networking are critical in the globalized world.” —MNP fellow
Some MNP fellows featured in case studies also benefited greatly from relationships formed during EF. Two MNP alumni reported that their relationships led directly to larger outcomes—in one case, the establishment of a university exchange program, and in another case, nomination to and involvement with regional and international organizations.

USA fellows have fewer opportunities to build relationships with one another during the program, since they are traveling in different countries and do not have a mid-program retreat. One USA fellow summarized his feelings about traveling alone, saying, “I was really struck, really struck—I went on an eight-week trip and spent most of it by myself. I felt like a traveling salesman...” Some USA fellows have established relationships with each other after the fellowship, as EF alumni, and reported that these relationships are useful. In terms of relationships with professionals met abroad, USA fellows featured in case studies reported that they maintain some contacts, but these were sporadic and there were no specific plans for utilization of the relationships.

**Societal-level Outcomes**

Societal-level outcomes for the Eisenhower Fellowships include fellows making more and deeper impacts in their (current or new) professional fields, and the development of new programs, policies, institutions or organizations, often as a result of strategic collaborations formed during the fellowship. Societal-level outcomes benefit a broad constituency outside of the fellows’ immediate realm. When this type of outcome occurs, it is difficult to attribute directly or solely to the Eisenhower experience because it is generally a confluence of factors that creates large-scale change. Also, since EF intentionally selects demonstrated leaders to be fellows, it is likely
that these individuals would achieve high levels of success with or without the fellowship. Finally, the evaluation has no way to measure “more and deeper impacts” because it is impossible to know what fellows would have accomplished without the program.

However, in a few of the case studies, it is clear that particular relationships or ideas gained through the EF experience directly contributed to the development of longer-term outcomes. For example, one fellow has engaged another cohort member as a partner in his private company, which he hopes will ultimately lead to social improvements in his country. Another fellow continues to develop strategic international collaborations to promote standardization practices globally—a practice that she began during her travels in the United States. Another used models and information gathered in the U.S. to start a women’s studies program within her university.

On the survey, about half (51%) of the respondents indicated that their fellowship experience had contributed directly to strategic collaborations resulting in new programs, policies, or institutions (see Table 3.3).

15 Fifty-two (52) percent of respondents said “Yes” when asked if EF had led directly to any strategic collaborations resulting in new programs, policies, or institutions. However, when asked to describe these changes, some described changes that were actually individual level changes. These were subtracted from the percentage claiming societal-level outcomes. In addition, some respondents listed organizational level changes that may be considered organizational-level outcomes. We have still included these responses in Table 3.3.

| Table 3.3 |
| How the Fellowship Contributed to Strategic Collaborations, New Programs, Policies, Institutions or Organizations |
| Responses were Coded into the Following Categories: | % of Respondents |
| Led to critical alliances, collaborations, or relationships | 39% |
| Strengthened, improved, or expanded an organization or business | 19% |
| Established a new program or Center within a current organization | 16% |
| Added or enhanced an international dimension to the work | 13% |
| Changes in policies, law | 10% |
| Developed new courses, seminars | 6% |
| Too soon to tell | 6% |
| Established a new organization or business | 5% |
| (Vague, broad, or ambiguous responses) | 5% |
| Increased public attention to an idea or issue | 5% |
| Established a new type of organization/institution | 4% |
| Other | 4% |
| Organized exchanges or exchange programs | 3% |
| Produced new materials (books, websites, publications) | 3% |
| Attempted but failed to initiate a project | 3% |
| No effect | 1% |

N=231 respondents (some answers corresponded with more than one response category, thus the total of all percentages exceeds 100)
Examples of societal-level outcomes described by fellows in open-ended survey responses include:

[I] founded a school for teenage mothers and ten years later there are now 17 open and 50 in the Ministry of Education's master plan... The school has received national acclaim and international recognition. Nothing would have been possible without the EF input, as I was able to take the best of US schools to start my school... Now any school or community group attached to a school in New Zealand can set up a Teen Parent Unit and attached child-care facility based on my model.

I was offered a UN post due to a contact I made in the States and this helped to bring about some changes in developing countries.

I was able to incorporate many of the things I learned to legislation passed in the House, mainly in matters of labor relations, which was the theme of my Fellowship.

New environmental regulations were drafted in Jordan that reflected [my] US experience. New methods of pollution control were incorporated in the working procedures.

My school (in Mexico) organizes a group of students in a visit to France for courses during the summer. During the visit my students interact with EF fellows from that country. I have had several videoconferences and guest lecturers in my classes with people I contacted during my fellowship. My EF experience not only touched MY life, it is touching the lives of my students as well.

**Findings about Program Activities**

Fellows responding to the survey felt strongly that EF staff had welcomed their input and taken into account their ideas when planning their itineraries prior to the fellowship. They agreed that EF had provided adequate information about their itineraries and travel plans prior to departure. One case study fellow that participated in the USA program suggested that EF could do more to organize materials (books, articles, websites, etc.) so that fellows can learn about the social, historical, economic and political context of countries prior to visiting. A few fellows featured in case studies also suggested that the program pay closer attention to matching the skills and interests of fellows with program officers to ensure a good “fit.” One fellow felt that her travel in South America (including both logistics and content) would have been better if her EF program officer had spoken Spanish.

When asked to rate the value of particular activities during the EF experience, fellows rated two activities far above the rest: appointments with professionals (including visits to their organizations), and meetings and discussions with the cohort of EF fellows. Fellows strongly agreed that their appointments were relevant to their interests and work and provided useful information and ideas. In case studies, almost all of the USA fellows lamented not having had a cohort experience similar to that of international fellows. They saw this as an extremely attractive component of the program for MNP and SNP/SRP fellows.
Fellows also valued the participation of their spouses in EF—most (71%) survey respondents brought their spouses with them for at least part of the experience. The fact that EF allows spouses to participate is a unique and meaningful aspect of the program. Other EF activities, including opening seminar, mid-program retreat, closing seminar, and events with staff and trustees, were also very valuable to fellows, although to a lesser degree than the activities discussed above. Fellows agreed that opening seminar prepared them adequately for the fellowship and provided useful information about the U.S. (or country visited), and that mid-program retreat and/or closing seminar provided meaningful opportunities to reflect on the fellowship experience and engage in discussions about it. They agreed—but to a lesser degree—that meetings and events with EF trustees and President’s Advisory Council members were valuable networking opportunities.

In case studies, some fellows expressed that they would have liked the opportunity to make presentations and engage in more deliberate information-sharing about their country or field while visiting the U.S. While they found their appointments valuable, they commented that there were more opportunities for them to learn from Americans than there were to share their own culture with groups of people. Greater opportunities to present and share during the fellowship may also help to fuel closer or more personal and professional connections by creating a greater exchange of information, cultures, and ideas.

Concerning EF activities that occur post-fellowship, most (92%) of the survey respondents from a country with an active alumni group said that they were somewhat or very involved with the group (currently or in the past).16 More than half of all respondents (67%) reported being somewhat or very involved in EF recruitment or nominations, and three quarters (77%) said they were somewhat or very involved in providing hospitality or professional contacts and support to visiting fellows, EF staff or trustees. Only 36% reported that they have been involved in public relations or fundraising on behalf of EF. Similarly, in case studies fellows reported having maintained some relationships formed during EF. They felt that EF could take a stronger position in facilitating networking and alumni activities. One fellow expressed that EF should more clearly communicate to fellows the expectation that they will participate in the network and activities following EF, and should more actively organize and promote alumni activities.

One-third (33%) of fellows said that they have not attended any EF conferences since their fellowship. Forty-six (46) percent have attended one to two conferences, and the remainder of fellows have attended three or more conferences. When we looked more closely at the characteristics of fellows who have not attended any conferences, we learned that 12% participated in EF in 2004 and therefore have probably not had the opportunity to attend any EF conferences. There were no other noticeable differences between fellows that have not attended conferences and the rest of the survey respondents.

---

16 Sixty-five (65) percent of respondents reported that there was an alumni organization in their country. These fellows were from 48 different countries.


Table 3.4
Open-Ended Survey Item: Describe Your Suggestions for How EF Could Be Improved or Strengthened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions Category</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: post-EF activities and network</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments, no suggestions</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: public relations and increasing the visibility of EF</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: EF publications and resources (including website)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: nomination and selection of fellows</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: EF conferences</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: the actual EF experience (travel, conferences, orientation, etc.)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: central mission and values of EF</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vague, broad, or ambiguous responses)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions re: program planning</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=347 respondents (some answers corresponded with more than one response category, thus the total of all percentages exceeds 100)

The fellows who have attended conferences rated the overall usefulness of the meetings as a 3 on a scale from 0 (not at all useful) to 4 (extremely useful). A few fellows profiled in case studies felt that EF should keep in mind the differing financial positions of alumni when planning network activities. Some fellows said they would very much like to participate in regular meetings (or conferences); however, it is financially prohibitive for them to do so. They suggested that EF should consider establishing a small grants or scholarship program to offset travel or other network-building costs for fellows who otherwise would not be able to participate in such activities.

Suggestions for Improvement

While alumni attributed many positive effects to their fellowship experience, they also had a variety of suggestions concerning how EF could be strengthened. When asked to describe how EF could be improved, survey responses were so varied that they could only be grouped into broad categories (see Table 3.4). Thirty-nine (39) percent of respondents were concerned with post-fellowship activities including EF alumni associations, activities, the general EF network and EF staff’s facilitation of it, and networking across countries and issue areas. We will return below to a discussion of post-fellowship issues.

Thirteen (13) percent of respondents encouraged EF to increase or enhance their public relations efforts and improve the visibility of the program in different countries. Some of these fellows suggested building relationships with U.S. embassies in other countries to facilitate EF being better known. Case study interviews and survey data also suggest that some fellows do not believe the program is well-known in their countries. When asked, “How well-known is EF in professional and leadership circles in your country,” survey respondents said that the program is...
“moderately” well-known (an average score of 2 on a scale from 0=not at all well-known, to 4=very well-known).

Nine (9) percent of fellows made suggestions concerning the nominations and selection processes, including who the program selects as fellows and how they are selected. Within this broad category, there existed a wide range of suggestions, none of which emerged as more prominent than the rest. For example, some fellows suggested that EF select more fellows from their home country, some suggested that there be greater representation of a certain field (banking, for example), and some made suggestions about which countries are—and should be—invited to participate in the MNP program.

In addition to survey respondents, many of the fellows profiled in case studies commented that EF should expand the diversity of its fellows. Some of them specified diversity in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, and age, and others clarified that they would like to see a greater diversity of economic classes represented. Some also suggested supporting more diversity in terms of professional affiliations. Their concern was that there were too many wealthy fellows hailing from traditional corporate professions, and too few civil servants. In terms of the selection process, one of the key informants from the case studies suggested that EF should place greater emphasis on a candidate’s potential for learning, not just what they have accomplished to date. In this way, the program would be sure to maximize the learning and growth gained via the fellowship experience.

Eight percent of respondents made suggestions about the actual EF experience, including the length and content of the fellowship. Here again, suggestions varied widely. Some suggested EF be longer; some suggested that fellows stay in one place for a greater amount of time; and some suggested that fellows attend more conferences and workshops or make presentations more often. Six percent of fellows made comments related to EF’s central goals and mission, including suggesting a shift in EF’s focus, or that EF re-examine its mission. Examples of these types of responses include:

Focus needs to be [to] get the EF Network to bridge the gap between the USA and the Muslim world. If [this is] not done we will soon not find meaningful fellows from this community, failing the very mission the Fellowship was established for.

Re-read the mission of EF in view of the reality of the world today.

Twenty-three (23) percent of the respondents’ suggestions were grouped into the Other category; however, there were some clear themes within this category. Approximately 3% of all respondents suggested some type of program enlargement or expansion, including adding more of a specific type of program each year (for example, more SNP/SRP programs) or increasing the number of USA fellows sent abroad, as well as general suggestions that the program be bigger in order to establish a greater presence globally. Another 2% suggested that EF staff or stakeholders visit countries more often and establish an EF presence abroad through regional EF offices or regional partners. Two percent had comments about the composition of the EF staff and stakeholders; for example, a few felt that the organization was very conservative politically, and should expand its composition.
Returning now to the numerous suggestions regarding post-fellowship networks and activities, Table 3.5 shows a more detailed breakdown of these suggestions. Many were about strengthening the EF network generally, including suggestions for more frequent and more facilitated communication among fellows. Another theme was that EF should strengthen the alumni activities of a certain country or region (18% of suggestions), or strengthen alumni associations in countries where none exist or the current association is weak (15%).

Some suggestions (9%) related to fellows wanting to connect with each other according to their professional interests and wanting EF to connect them to others in their field. Four percent of the responses suggested specific projects or issue areas for EF to get involved in. These included international projects bringing together fellows from around the world. Overall, the fact that so many responses dealt with post-fellowship activities and connections is evidence that fellows are interested in and concerned about the EF network, and that they would like EF to take action to strengthen it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions concerning:</th>
<th>% of Suggestions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening and improving EF network overall (including communications)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting alumni meetings, activities, or events in… (a specific country or region)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging/supporting the formation of alumni groups in places with no or weak groups</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the number of alumni events and reunions</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting fellows by field or professional interest areas</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging relationships between alumni from different countries, including sending fellows to countries other than the U.S. for the fellowship</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the involvement of alumni in EF processes and planning</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating alumni for specific projects or programs, or for international projects</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using fellows to share and promote the values of EF within their countries and communities</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This chart is based on the number of suggestions made re: post-fellowship activities (137), rather than the number of fellows who made them. Some fellows made more than one suggestion in their response.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Below we summarize the findings of the evaluation, discuss their implications, and make some recommendations for program refinement to be considered by Eisenhower Fellowships staff and stakeholders. It is important to keep in mind that this evaluation is based primarily on feedback from fellows and relies upon their personal opinions and judgments, which vary from individual to individual and are based on differing values and beliefs. Therefore, the evaluation feedback should be considered as a mirror reflecting the thoughts and experiences of EF alumni.

- **The evaluation findings show that the Eisenhower Fellowships has been highly effective in creating positive impacts.** The program has had a particularly strong effect on the individual fellows who participate, leading them to gain broader, more international perspectives as well as enhanced professional knowledge, self-confidence, and leadership skills. Most fellows reported that the experience had significant effects on their overall perspective, knowledge, goals, and leadership skills. EF has also contributed to a variety of organizational and/or societal-level impacts, although we cannot attribute these impacts solely to the program because such changes are usually due to multiple influences including natural career progression and achievement among fellows. About half of the fellows reported that their EF experience led directly to the development of organizational and societal-level impacts, and their descriptions of these outcomes paint an impressive portrait of new programs, policies, and collaborations that benefit a variety of people and countries.

- **USA fellows reported the fewest program impacts following EF, and those in the SNP/SRP program reported the most impacts** (and the difference between fellows from the MNP and SNP/SRP programs was not very large). Differences in societal-level outcomes were especially noticeable and statistically significant. That there were fewer impacts among USA fellows may be related to the fact that the USA program is the most recent EF program as well as to differences in the design of the USA program, including a shorter orientation, weaker cohort design, shorter travel experience, and absence of a mid-program retreat. USA fellows interviewed for case studies noted the lack of a cohort experience in particular. EF staff and stakeholders should consider these programmatic differences and explore ways in which the USA program could be made more similar to the international program experience. Consideration should also be given to any differences that exist in how fellows are communicated with or organized for alumni activities following the fellowship.

- **The data also suggest that program impacts vary to some extent according to the personal characteristics of fellows, particularly their age at the time of the fellowship, and their gender.** Fellows who were older when they participated in EF reported more organizational and societal-level effects than those who were younger. Similarly, men reported more effects (particularly organizational-level-level effects, but also societal-level) than women.\(^{17}\) These differences probably relate to the past experience of the fellows, and their level of development when they enter EF. While the differences were not statistically significant, they point out the fact that different people

\(^{17}\) It is important to realize that these differences by age and gender may show actual differences in impact, or they may be illuminating that different groups—men, women, younger fellows, older fellows, etc.—perceive and report on the effects of their EF experience differently. In addition, in most countries, women are more likely than men to face leadership challenges due to societal and cultural prejudices.
have more or less to gain from EF depending on where they are starting. In order to maximize the program’s impact for all fellows, EF may want to consider a closer examination of women’s and younger fellows’ experiences prior to, during, and after the fellowship. This type of examination could provide insight as to how EF could better meet the needs of these groups and how it could provide ongoing support for maximizing the fellowship’s impact. Focus groups would be one means of conducting such an examination.

- **Fellows were very satisfied with the fellowship activities and particularly valued their meetings with professionals and interactions with their cohort members, as well as the participation of their spouses.** The cohort experience is important also because cohort members maintain stronger relationships with one another after EF than some other groups who come into contact during the fellowship. EF should continue to use cohort meetings and discussions to augment the travel experience for international fellows, and consider ways to further highlight or enhance this aspect of the program since fellows find it to be particularly effective. Also, similar to the second conclusion/recommendation above, EF should strengthen the cohort experience for USA fellows. Adding (or strengthening) the cohort component may increase the overall impacts of the fellowship for this group. EF should also preserve spousal participation in the program, as this is a unique and valued aspect of the fellowship, and one which is utilized by most fellows.

- **The evaluation found that EF fellows represent a population likely to experience high levels of career transition following the fellowship, and this should be taken into account in program planning.** Staff and stakeholders should discuss career change and progression with fellows, including how such changes may affect leadership and personal and professional goals. Orientation, mid-program meetings, closing seminars, and post-fellowship communications are opportunities for such discussions to take place. The program should also consider how to provide resources and support to alumni when they experience career transitions, for example by linking them with other alumni in their new professional field. EF’s website is a forum where resources on career changes could be placed, so that fellows experiencing career transitions can access the resources. The program should also consider whether the impacts that fellows gain from EF are sustainable throughout career transitions. The program should avoid becoming narrowly focused on specific job skills or knowledge, and may similarly want to avoid selecting fellows who are narrowly focused.

- **Fellows’ suggestions for program improvement clearly indicate the desire for more alumni activities and networking opportunities; however, they would like these opportunities to be organized and facilitated for them.** Fellows have many ideas for projects, alumni events, meetings, and networking tools, and would like EF to take the lead in these matters. Stronger facilitation of post-fellowship activities may have many benefits—for example, stronger relationships among alumni and between alumni and EF staff and stakeholders. These relationships are in place to some extent currently (many fellows reported having occasional contact with others from EF, or participating in some conferences or EF alumni activities); however, strengthening them could lead to the development of additional organizational-level and societal-level outcomes, which are not as prevalent as individual-level effects.
• **Fellows (and selected stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation) do not believe that EF is very well-known in their countries.** All of the data sources for this evaluation—case studies, survey data, and interviews with trustees and stakeholders—support this conclusion. The second most common suggestion that fellows made for program improvement was to increase public relations about the program. Alumni also suggested enlarging EF and establishing regional offices to increase the program’s presence in different parts of the world. EF should consider whether enhancing the program’s profile is a priority; if so, explore options for doing so, keeping in mind that since EF is a far-reaching program, this will be a challenging task. The program may want to consider targeted approaches—for example, raising its profile in specific countries.

• **EF should continue to evaluate its programs using one-year and five-year post-fellowship surveys.** Surveying alumni one year after their fellowship and again four years later would allow staff and stakeholders to collect a rich set of data indicating how and when impacts develop following the EF experience. OMG has drafted one-year and five-year survey instruments (included as Appendix D), which could be sent to fellows as an online survey (and mailed to those fellows who do not have access to the internet). Implementing these surveys would also allow EF to maintain more consistent communication with fellows and collect updated contact information from them. The five-year survey instrument is designed so that it could also be used for additional follow-up data collection (i.e., at 10, 15 or 20 years post-fellowship).
## Appendix A: List of Trustee and Alumni Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRUSTEES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2004</td>
<td>Roger Enrico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2004</td>
<td>Theodore Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2004</td>
<td>H.A. Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2004</td>
<td>Jim Hovey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2004</td>
<td>Kimball Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FELLOWS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 2004</td>
<td>Peter Skillern (USA - North Carolina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2004</td>
<td>Elena Kolovskaya (SNP - Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2004</td>
<td>David Lavery (SNP – Northern Ireland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Case Study Interview Guides
EISENHOWER FELLOWSHIPS
CASE STUDIES

Interview Protocol for Fellows

A. Background

1. How did you learn about Eisenhower Fellowships?

2. (If not already known:) Tell me about your job before the fellowship. Who was your employer, what was your title, and what types of responsibilities did you have at work?

3. Before EF, what were your career goals and expectations for your professional life?

4. Before EF, did you think of yourself as a leader? Why or why not?

B. Description of Fellowship Experience

5. What were the highlights of your fellowship experience in the U.S. (or country visited)—what activities, seminars, or meetings were the highlights of your trip?

C. Outcomes/Impacts

6. When you returned home after your fellowship, what new skills, knowledge or perspectives had you gained as a result of the experience?

   a. Which program activity(ies) led to that skill, perspective, or knowledge?

7. (For each skill, knowledge or perspective mentioned in #6:) how have you been able to apply this to your work or life since the fellowship?

8. To what extent, and how, did you share the learning you gained during EF with others (could be formal or informal sharing such as presentations, lectures, or discussions with friends and colleagues)?

9. Did your EF experience affect your organization and its work? If so, how?

10. Did your EF experience affect your civic or professional associations? If so, how?

11. Did the experience change your perception of yourself as a leader? If so, what changed?
12. Do you feel that the experience affected other peoples’ perception of you as a leader? If so, can you describe this change and how you became aware of it?

13. Did your EF experience change the way that you look at the world or your overall perspective and attitudes? If so, how?

14. Did your EF experience change, enhance or otherwise affect your career or life goals? If so, what changed and why?

15. Has what you learned as a result of EF directly contributed to any new projects, programs, policies, or other professional accomplishments? If so, give examples.

16. Describe your career progression since your fellowship – have you remained at the same organization and in the same field? Have your responsibilities changed? Has your role as a leader increased?
   a. In your opinion, would these changes have occurred regardless of EF or do you feel that EF strongly affected your career path?

D. Network and Relationships

17. Did your EF experience affect your personal or professional network? If so, how?

18. How do you use the EF network?

19. Describe a specific example of how a relationship or network that you formed as a result of EF has been beneficial to your life or career.

20. Are you involved in the EF alumni association in your country? If so, what types of activities do you participate in, and how often?

E. Concluding Questions re: Overall Impact

21. Have you been able to access or leverage new or greater resources for your work as a result of your fellowship experience? If so, how?

22. How relevant is your fellowship experience in the U.S. (or country visited) to your current life and work? To what extent and in what ways do you continue to draw on the knowledge or resources that you gained?

23. Thinking about all the changes, impacts and learning involved in your EF experience, are there impacts that we haven’t discussed but that you feel are important to mention?

24. How do you think EF could be improved, in terms of the fellowship experience and/or the network?
A. Background

1. Verify their name and spelling

2. How do you know Fellow?

3. How long have you known Fellow / or, when did you meet Fellow?

B. Fellowship Experience

4. How well did you know Fellow in 19XX / 200X, when s/he participated in Eisenhower Fellowships? What was your relationship at that time?

5. Did Fellow talk to you about the Eisenhower Fellowships, his/her experience in [the U.S.] and his/her impressions of the country?
   a. If yes, what types of things do you remember him/her talking about?

6. Did s/he talk to you about any particular knowledge, innovations, ideas, or models that s/he’d learned about?

7. Did s/he talk to you about any particular people who s/he’d met with during his/her fellowship?

8. Do you know if Fellow made any formal presentations about the fellowship experience after s/he returned home, or how s/he shared the learning with others?

C. Impacts

9. If you think about Fellow before his/her fellowship compared to afterward, did you notice any changes in him/her that may have been a result of the fellowship experience? If so, please describe.
   a. Prompt: were his/her attitude, outlook on life, perspectives or goals noticeably different after s/he returned?

10. Again, thinking about Fellow before and after the fellowship, do you notice that s/he had developed new skills, knowledge or resources during Eisenhower Fellowships? If so, please describe.
11. (If Informant knows the work of the fellow:) Did Fellow’s professional work change or improve after the fellowship? If so, please describe.
   a. Has this change/improvement affected his/her organization overall, its programs, clients, financial status, or any aspect of the work?

12. Did Fellow’s network of personal and professional contacts change as a result of the fellowship?
   a. If so, how has this affected Fellow’s life or work? Have any of the relationships s/he formed during EF been particularly important?

13. Can you describe Fellow’s career path during the time you’ve known him/her – has s/he remained in the same position and field, or has s/he advanced or changed fields?

14. Are there any other types of changes or developments that we have not discussed that occurred in Fellow’s life and that you believe may be related to their fellowship experience?

D. Overall Impressions of the Fellow, their Leadership and Accomplishments

15. Do you think of Fellow as a “leader”? If so, why? What are some things that s/he has done that make you think s/he is a leader?
   a. Have you always thought of him/her as a leader? If not, when did you begin to think of him/her in this way?

16. Are there any specific achievements – for example, new policies, programs or procedures – that Fellow has contributed to that you feel are important accomplishments and may be related to their experience in EF?

17. To your knowledge, is Fellow more actively involved in professional associations, community life, or politics than s/he was before the fellowship?

18. Is there any other information that you’d like to share with me about Fellow or about the Eisenhower Fellowships that we haven’t discussed yet?
Appendix C: Online Survey Instrument
EISENHOWER FELLOWSHIPS
IMPACT SURVEY

In which EF Program did you participate? (use an “X” to indicate your answer)

___ Multi-Nation Program (MNP)
___ Single Nation/Single Region Program (SNP/SRP)
___ USA Fellows

A. BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What country were you representing at the time of your fellowship?

________________________________________

2. In what year did your Eisenhower Fellowship occur?

_________________________________________

3. What was your age at the time of your fellowship?

___ 30 or under
___ 31-35
___ 36-40
___ 41-45
___ 46-50
___ 51 or over

4. What was your field of work at the time of your fellowship?

________________________________________

5. What is your gender?

___ Male
___ Female

6. If you were married at the time of your fellowship, did your spouse/partner accompany you during part or all of your fellowship?

___ Yes
___ No
___ No spouse at that time
B. VALUE OF EISENHOWER FELLOWSHIP ACTIVITIES

7. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by placing an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer. Select “Not Applicable” (N/A) if a statement does not apply to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prior to my fellowship, EF provided adequate information on my itinerary and travel plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) EF staff welcomed my input and incorporated my ideas when planning my itinerary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) EF’s opening seminar prepared me adequately for my fellowship and provided useful information about the U.S. and its culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) EF’s mid-program retreat and/or closing seminar provided meaningful opportunities to reflect on the fellowship experience and engage in discussions about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) My appointments with individual leaders/experts were relevant to my interests and work, and provided useful information and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) My appointments provided me with access to new, high-level contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) EF communicated to me the importance of the lifelong EF network and the expectation that I would participate in and contribute to it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Events with EF trustees and President’s Advisory Council members were valuable networking opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How valuable were the following aspects of your fellowship? Please rate them on a scale from 0 (not at all valuable) to 4 (extremely valuable) by placing an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer. Select “Not Applicable” or N/A if an item does not apply to your fellowship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 Not at all valuable</th>
<th>1 Somewhat valuable</th>
<th>2 Valuable</th>
<th>3 Very valuable</th>
<th>4 Extremely valuable</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Opening seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Mid-program retreat and closing seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Appointments with individual leaders/experts and visits to organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Participation in relevant seminars or conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Meetings, events, and/or visits with EF alumni, trustees, President’s Advisory Council members, and other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Participation of your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Meetings and discussions with your group of fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. OUTCOMES/IMPACTS

9. Overall, how would you describe the effect of your Eisenhower Fellowship on your personal and professional development?

___0 (Extremely negative)
___1 (Somewhat negative)
___2 (Neutral)
___3 (Somewhat positive)
___4 (Extremely positive)
10. To what extent did your fellowship enhance or have a positive effect on… *(place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) …your professional knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) …your international perspective and worldview?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) …your understanding of the U.S., its culture and its institutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) …your ideas and plans for your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) …your personal and/or professional goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) …your self-confidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) …your ideas about leadership in general?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) …your perception of yourself as a leader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Overall, please describe the most significant effect(s) that your fellowship had on you and/or your career. If it didn’t affect you at all, please write “No Effect”

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
12a. Have you changed professional fields since your fellowship?

____ Yes
____ No

12b. If yes, to what extent was your fellowship a contributing factor in this change?

____ 0 (Not at all)
____ 1 (Contributed a very small amount)
____ 2 (Somewhat)
____ 3 (Contributed significantly)
____ 4 (Extremely relevant/contributed directly to the change)

13a. Did your fellowship experience contribute *directly* to any changes or improvements in organizations or institutions that you are involved with (for example, changes in management style, mission, services, or clients)?

____ Yes
____ No

13b. If yes, please describe the change(s):

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

14a. Did your fellowship experience contribute *directly* to any strategic collaborations that resulted in the development of new programs, policies, institutions, or organizations?

____ Yes
____ No

14b. If yes, please describe:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
15. To what degree did your fellowship experience contribute directly to your assuming positions of greater scope or influence (for example, promotions, positions of greater leadership in the public or in organizations that you are involved with, having more direct input to decision-making, greater impact in your country, etc.)?

   ___ 0 (Not at all)
   ___ 1 (Contributed a very small amount)
   ___ 2 (Moderate contribution)
   ___ 3 (Contributed significantly)
   ___ 4 (Very strong contribution)

D. EF NETWORK QUESTIONS

16. a) Is there an EF alumni association in your country?

   ___ Yes
   ___ No

   b) If yes, to what degree have you been involved in association meetings and activities?

   ___ Not at all
   ___ Somewhat (I have participated in some meetings, events, etc.)
   ___ Very Involved (I participate in most or all meetings, events, etc.)

17. Have you been involved in EF nominating committees or recruiting new fellows?

   ___ Not at all
   ___ Somewhat Involved
   ___ Very Involved

18. Have you been involved in providing hospitality or professional contacts and support to visiting fellows, EF staff or trustees?

   ___ Not at all
   ___ Somewhat Involved
   ___ Very Involved

19. Have you been involved in public relations or fundraising efforts on behalf of EF?

   ___ Not at all
   ___ Somewhat Involved
   ___ Very Involved
20. Currently, how often do you have contact with… (place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) …fellows from your EF program group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) …EF alumni in your country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) …professionals/other individuals you met during your U.S. fellowship experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) …EF staff, trustees, President’s Advisory Council members, USA fellows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How would you rate the usefulness of the relationships you gained from EF in terms of benefiting your professional career and network?

   ___ 0 (Not at all useful)
   ___ 1 (A little bit useful)
   ___ 2 (Moderately useful)
   ___ 3 (Useful)
   ___ 4 (Extremely useful)

22. How would you rate the usefulness of your EF relationships in terms of your social network and interests?

   ___ 0 (Not at all useful)
   ___ 1 (A little bit useful)
   ___ 2 (Moderately useful)
   ___ 3 (Useful)
   ___ 4 (Extremely useful)

23. How often do you use or read the following EF resources? (place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) EF newsletter and other EF communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Web news of EF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Web/Intra-Ike directory of fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Web/Intra-Ike discussion forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. a) How many EF conferences have you attended since your fellowship experience?

___ None
___ 1
___ 2
___ 3
___ 4 – 6
___ 7 – 9
___ 10 or more

b) Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of these conferences:

___ 0 (Not at all useful)
___ 1 (A little bit useful)
___ 2 (Moderately useful)
___ 3 (Useful)
___ 4 (Extremely useful)
___ I have not attended EF conferences

25. How well-known is EF in professional and leadership circles in the country that you represented on your fellowship?

___ 0 (Not at all)
___ 1 (A little)
___ 2 (Moderately)
___ 3 (Well-known)
___ 4 (Very well-known)

26. Thinking about your EF experiences overall, including both your fellowship and your involvement in the lifelong EF network, please describe any suggestions for how EF could be improved or strengthened.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for providing valuable feedback concerning the Eisenhower Fellowships!
Appendix D: Draft Instruments for Post-Fellowship Surveys (1-year and 5-year)
A. BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. In which EF Program did you participate?
   
   ___Multi-Nation Program (MNP)
   ___Single Nation/ Single Region Program (SNP/SRP)
   ___USA Fellows

2. What country were you representing at the time of your fellowship?
   
   __________________________________________

3. What was your age at the time of your fellowship?
   
   ___30 or under
   ___31-35
   ___36-40
   ___41-45
   ___46-50
   ___51 or over

4. What was your field of work at the time of your fellowship?
   
   __________________________________________

5. What is your gender?
   
   ___Male
   ___Female

6. If you were married at the time of your fellowship, did your spouse/partner accompany you during part or all of your fellowship?
   
   ___Yes
   ___No
   ___No spouse at that time
B. VALUE OF EISENHOWER FELLOWSHIP ACTIVITIES

7. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by placing an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer. Select “Not Applicable” (N/A) if a statement does not apply to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Prior to my fellowship, EF provided adequate information on my itinerary and travel plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) EF staff welcomed my input and incorporated my ideas when planning my itinerary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) EF’s opening seminar prepared me adequately for my fellowship and provided useful information about the U.S. and its culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) EF’s mid-program retreat and/or closing seminar provided meaningful opportunities to reflect on the fellowship experience and engage in discussions about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) My appointments with individual leaders/experts were relevant to my interests and work, and provided useful information and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) My appointments provided me with access to new, high-level contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) EF communicated to me the importance of the lifelong EF network and the expectation that I would participate in and contribute to it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Events with EF trustees and President’s Advisory Council members were valuable networking opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How valuable were the following aspects of your fellowship? Please rate them on a scale from 0 (not at all valuable) to 4 (extremely valuable) by placing an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer. Select “Not Applicable” or N/A if an item does not apply to your fellowship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 Not at all valuable</th>
<th>1 Somewhat valuable</th>
<th>2 Valuable</th>
<th>3 Very valuable</th>
<th>4 Extremely valuable</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Opening seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Mid-program retreat and closing seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Appointments with individual leaders/experts and visits to organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Participation in relevant seminars or conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Meetings, events, and/or visits with EF alumni, trustees, President’s Advisory Council members, and other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Participation of your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Meetings and discussions with your group of fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. OUTCOMES/IMPACTS

9. Overall, how would you describe the effect of your Eisenhower Fellowship on your personal and professional development?

___ 0 (Extremely negative)
___ 1 (Somewhat negative)
___ 2 (Neutral)
___ 3 (Somewhat positive)
___ 4 (Extremely positive)
10. To what extent did your fellowship enhance or have a positive effect on… (place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 No effect</th>
<th>1 Small effect</th>
<th>2 Moderate effect</th>
<th>3 Strong effect</th>
<th>4 Very strong effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) …your professional knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) …your international perspective and worldview?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) …your understanding of the U.S., its culture and its institutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) …your ideas and plans for your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) …your personal and/or professional goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) …your self-confidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) …your ideas about leadership in general?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) …your perception of yourself as a leader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Overall, please describe the most significant effect(s) that your fellowship had on you and/or your career. If it didn’t affect you at all, please write “No Effect”

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
12a. Have you changed professional fields since your fellowship?

___ Yes
___ No

12b. If yes, to what extent was your fellowship a contributing factor in this change?

___ 0 (Not at all)
___ 1 (Contributed a very small amount)
___ 2 (Somewhat)
___ 3 (Contributed significantly)
___ 4 (Extremely relevant/contributed directly to the change)

D. EF NETWORK QUESTIONS

13. a) Is there an EF alumni association in your country?

___ Yes
___ No

b) If yes, to what degree have you been involved in association meetings and activities?

___ Not at all
___ Somewhat (I have participated in some meetings, events, etc.)
___ Very Involved (I participate in most or all meetings, events, etc.)

14. Have you been involved in EF nominating committees or recruiting new fellows?

___ Yes
___ No
15. How often do you have contact with… *(place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) …fellows from your EF program group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) …EF alumni in your country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) …professionals/other individuals you met during your U.S. fellowship experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) …EF staff, trustees, President’s Advisory Council members, USA fellows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How would you rate the usefulness of the relationships you gained from EF?

   ___ 0 (Not at all useful)  
   ___ 1 (A little bit useful)  
   ___ 2 (Moderately useful)  
   ___ 3 (Useful)  
   ___ 4 (Extremely useful)  

17. How often do you use or read the following EF resources? *(place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) EF newsletter and other EF communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Web news of EF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Web/Intra-Ike directory of fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Web/Intra-Ike discussion forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Thinking about your EF experiences overall, including both your fellowship and your involvement in the lifelong EF network, please describe any suggestions for how EF could be improved or strengthened.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

*Thank you for providing valuable feedback concerning the Eisenhower Fellowships!*

Eisenhower Fellowships
Final Evaluation Report
A. BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. In which EF Program did you participate?
   
   ___Multi-Nation Program (MNP)
   ___Single Nation/Single Region Program (SNP/SRP)
   ___USA Fellows

2. What country were you representing at the time of your fellowship?
   
   __________________________________________

3. What was your age at the time of your fellowship?
   
   ___30 or under
   ___31-35
   ___36-40
   ___41-45
   ___46-50
   ___51 or over

4. What is your field of work currently?
   
   __________________________________________

5. What is your gender?
   
   ___Male
   ___Female

6. If you were married at the time of your fellowship, did your spouse/partner accompany you during part or all of your fellowship?
   
   ___Yes
   ___No
   ___No spouse at that time
B. OUTCOMES/IMPACTS

7. Overall, how would you describe the effect of your Eisenhower Fellowship on your personal and professional development?

___ 0 (Extremely negative)
___ 1 (Somewhat negative)
___ 2 (Neutral)
___ 3 (Somewhat positive)
___ 4 (Extremely positive)

8. To what extent did your fellowship enhance or have a positive effect on… (place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 No effect</th>
<th>1 Small effect</th>
<th>2 Moderate effect</th>
<th>3 Strong effect</th>
<th>4 Very strong effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) ...your professional knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ...your international perspective and worldview?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) ...your understanding of the U.S., its culture and its institutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) ...your ideas and plans for your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) ...your personal and/or professional goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) ...your self-confidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) ...your ideas about leadership in general?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) ...your perception of yourself as a leader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9a. Have you changed professional fields since your fellowship?

___ Yes
___ No

b. If yes, to what extent was your fellowship a contributing factor in this change?

___ 0 (Not at all)
___ 1 (Contributed a very small amount)
___ 2 (Somewhat)
___ 3 (Contributed significantly)
___ 4 (Extremely relevant/contributed directly to the change)

10a. Did your fellowship experience contribute directly to any changes or improvements in organizations or institutions that you are involved with (for example, changes in management style, mission, services, or clients)?

___ Yes
___ No

b. If yes, please describe the change(s):

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

11a. Did your fellowship experience contribute directly to any strategic collaborations that resulted in the development of new programs, policies, institutions, or organizations?

___ Yes
___ No

b. If yes, please describe:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
12. To what degree did your fellowship experience contribute directly to your assuming positions of greater scope or influence (for example, promotions, positions of greater leadership in the public or in organizations that you are involved with, having more direct input to decision-making, greater impact in your country, etc.)?

   ___ 0 (Not at all)
   ___ 1 (Contributed a very small amount)
   ___ 2 (Moderate contribution)
   ___ 3 (Contributed significantly)
   ___ 4 (Very strong contribution)

D. EF NETWORK QUESTIONS

13. a) Is there an EF alumni association in your country?

   ___ Yes
   ___ No

   b) If yes, to what degree have you been involved in association meetings and activities?

   ___ Not at all
   ___ Somewhat (I have participated in some meetings, events, etc.)
   ___ Very Involved (I participate in most or all meetings, events, etc.)

14. Have you been involved in EF nominating committees or recruiting new fellows?

   ___ Yes
   ___ No

15. Have you been involved in providing hospitality or professional contacts and support to visiting fellows, EF staff or trustees?

   ___ Yes
   ___ No

16. Have you been involved in public relations or fundraising efforts on behalf of EF?

   ___ Yes
   ___ No
17. Currently, how often do you have contact with… *(place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) fellows from your EF program group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) EF alumni in your country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) professionals/other individuals you met during your U.S. fellowship experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) EF staff, trustees, President’s Advisory Council members, USA fellows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How would you rate the usefulness of the relationships you gained from EF?

___ 0 (Not at all useful)
___ 1 (A little bit useful)
___ 2 (Moderately useful)
___ 3 (Useful)
___ 4 (Extremely useful)

19. How often do you currently use or read the following EF resources? *(place an “X” in the box that best reflects your answer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) EF newsletter and other EF communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Web news of EF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Web/Intra-Ike directory of fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Web/Intra-Ike discussion forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. a) How many EF conferences have you attended since your fellowship experience?

___ None
___ 1
___ 2
___ 3
___ 4 or more

b) Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of these conferences:

___ 0 (Not at all useful)
___ 1 (A little bit useful)
___ 2 (Moderately useful)
___ 3 (Useful)
___ 4 (Extremely useful)
___ I have not attended EF conferences

21. How well-known is EF in professional and leadership circles in the country that you represented on your fellowship?

___ 0 (Not at all)
___ 1 (A little)
___ 2 (Moderately)
___ 3 (Well-known)
___ 4 (Very well-known)

22. Thinking about your EF experiences overall, including both your fellowship and your involvement in the lifelong EF network, please describe any suggestions for how EF could be improved or strengthened.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for providing valuable feedback concerning the Eisenhower Fellowships!
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Introduction

The Eisenhower Fellowships (EF) was created in 1953 in honor of President Dwight D. Eisenhower as a means of promoting international understanding and peace through the exchange of information, ideas, and perspectives among emerging leaders from different countries. Eisenhower Fellowships’ flagship program, the Multi-Nation Program (MNP), brings professionals from around the world to the United States to travel, meet with high-level contacts in their fields of interest, and participate in seminars, retreats and discussions with a cohort of international fellows. Two additional programs have been added to EF during the last 50 years—the Single Nation or Single Region Program (SNP/SRP), which brings groups of professionals from one region of the world to the U.S., and the USA Program, which sends professionals from the United States abroad. Fellows in all three programs enjoy individualized itineraries of meetings and travel tailored to their interests and goals, and have the option of having their spouse join them for part of the travel experience.

Stated goals of the Eisenhower Fellowships are to:

• Enhance the capacities of leaders who are likely to have increasing impacts on their nation’s development, by building individualized programs of professional inquiry and contact development in the United States; or in the case of USA fellows, abroad.

• Provide citizens of the United States with opportunities to understand the aims, achievements, and problems of different countries through meeting proven young leaders of those countries; conversely, provide citizens in other nations the opportunity to meet rising U.S. leaders.

• Create and sustain a unique lifetime network of leaders whose ties to one another and to the United States may foster continued personal growth and understanding and that encourage peace, productivity and progress.

In February 2004, Eisenhower Fellowships hired the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning (OMG) to conduct an evaluation of their programs. One component of the evaluation was case studies highlighting the experiences of 15 program alumni. These case studies convey the highlights of their fellowship experiences and discuss the development of individual-level and professional-level impacts following their return home. Each case study is based on one or more interviews with the fellow and, in most cases, interviews with two key informants—colleagues or friends who have known the fellow and their work since the time of the fellowship. Once the interviews were completed, OMG wrote the case studies as vignettes. Each vignette includes: a brief description of the fellow written by EF staff at the time of the fellowship, an overview of the fellow’s itinerary and meetings while on the fellowship, and a description of the highlights and impacts of the experience.

This report presents all 15 case studies, as well as an appendix describing OMG’s sampling methods for selecting the alumni who were featured. The findings of OMG’s other evaluation activities are included in a separate report, which is available from the Eisenhower Fellowships.

1 In a few cases, we were unable to reach key informants despite repeated attempts. Two case studies include interviews with only one key informant, and three include no key informants.
Gisela de Alencar
Brazil
SNP, 1996

Profile at Time of EF Participation

Gisela de Alencar is the Legislative Advisor to the House of Representatives in the Office of Legislative Research and Consultancy. An international environmental lawyer, Ms. Alencar’s present responsibilities include helping draft national legislation on social issues. In the United States, she will broaden her environmental perspective by focusing on the conservation of biological resources for agriculture and medicinal use. She plans to confer with experts engaged in biodiversity conservation and to examine exemplary research and development projects.

Fellowship Experience

During her Eisenhower fellowship, Gisela de Alencar met with more than 160 persons while visiting over 40 institutions from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors. She traveled to over 20 cities in 12 states, making for a very intense eight-week period. Most notable for Ms. Alencar were her visits with executives and scientists from private sector companies including Shaman Pharmaceuticals, Monsanto Company and Merck and Company. In addition, the fellow met with numerous members of governmental and consulting institutions including the National Research Council, the Department of State – Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, the President’s Council on Sustainable Development, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Environmental Protection Agency – the International Environmental Law Office, the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Library of Congress.

Ms. Alencar met with regional organizations including the Grand Canyon National Park General Management Implementation Team, the Foreign Trade Division of the Office of the Governor in Denver, Colorado and the Center for Plant Conservation at the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis.

In addition, Ms. Alencar met with representatives from 11 nonprofit organizations including the Rainforest Alliance Network, Sierra Club International, Rural Advancement Foundation, Environmental Law Institute and the Biodiversity Coalition to name a few. Finally, she met with scholars and academics from distinguished universities and institutions including Dartmouth College’s Institute on International Environmental Governance, Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Technology and Development Program, the Environment Program at the Fletcher School of Law at Tufts University, the University of California at Berkley’s Department of Agricultural and Resources Economics, Washington University Law School (St. Louis, MO), Harvard University Law School, and Duke University. Ms. Alencar commented that her meetings with renowned professors and members of academia were most influential in her personal development and rethinking of professional and personal goals.
Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

Participation in the Eisenhower Fellowships has had tremendous impacts on Ms. Alencar, both professionally and personally. Aside from providing her with cutting-edge information that she utilizes every day in her work, Ms. Alencar considered the fellowship an opportunity to test her knowledge and theories. Having come to the United States with a set agenda and a list of provocative and sometimes controversial questions, Ms. Alencar had the opportunity to gather opinions and debate her theories with a number of stakeholders in the environmental field. As a result, she gained increased self-confidence, redefined her professional goals and visions, and felt empowered to take additional risks in her career. The fellowship was an opportunity for Ms. Alencar to broaden her perspectives and opinions concerning American society, international relations, and her area of expertise. Overall, Ms. Alencar has maintained some connections with other fellows and a few of the experts that she met during her visit to the United States.

Ms. Alencar asserts that she has consolidated everything that she acquired through the fellowship in her professional life. Overall, the experience was simultaneously challenging (by design) and gratifying.

Building Confidence

Challenge is evident in Ms. Alencar’s Eisenhower itinerary. She worked very closely with her Program Officer, Diana Harding, to develop an agenda that would deliberately allow her to not only learn more about her field, but moreover to challenge and question her own theories. Since she views herself as a life-long civil servant, Ms. Alencar wanted to be exposed to a variety of environmental stakeholders – not only governmental, academic and nonprofit organizations, but more importantly, multi-national corporations. “I did not want to only speak with the executives and public relations people. I really wanted to speak with the scientists, and individuals doing cutting edge research and environmental work.” One of her key expectations for the fellowship was to understand the challenges and profiles of mega-corporations in the biotech field.

Speaking with unfamiliar audiences was a wonderful experience for Ms. Alencar. Often forced to express and defend opposing views – at Merck, Monsanto and even the Missouri Botanical Gardens – Ms. Alencar learned to set difficult agendas and ask difficult questions, and she gained insight into international perspectives. “I am more knowledgeable and more confident for having these experiences directly. These are not experiences that you can gather from a book or from the Internet.”

The fellowship presented Ms. Alencar with many differing points of view. She was forced to think creatively about issues, to exclude her prejudices (especially regarding the private sector) and to increase her knowledge through conversations and debates. Ms. Alencar referred to the Eisenhower Fellowship experience as a “test” – a test of knowledge, but also of integrity and personal conviction. About her discussions with corporate leaders she concluded, “I did not necessarily agree with them, but by increasing my knowledge I could relate more ‘normally’ to them as a person at the end of the twentieth century.” This ability to appreciate differing views translated well into her work. Ms. Ana Toni, a colleague and friend of Ms. Alencar, noted, “She

---

2 Ms. Ana Toni has known Ms. Alencar since 1999. They have worked together on numerous projects in the environmental law field. Ms. Alencar served on the Board of Greenpeace at the invitation of Ms. Toni –
has a huge range of contacts – she can work with government officials, civil society members, lawyers and academics. While she is very precise and solid in her legal work, she looks at arguments from different perspectives and tries to incorporate these opinions into her case.” Ms. Alencar’s exposure to multi-national pharmaceutical corporations proved invaluable, according to Ms. Toni: “Her knowledge of the for-profit industry – how it works, knowing their goals and objectives – was very useful in developing policies.”

In her meetings with executives and scientists at Merck and Monsanto, Ms. Alencar was exposed to the human side of corporate research. During these meetings she gained considerable insight into the reality of international competition and the pressures of research in the biotech field. A meeting with scientists at Merck and Co. resonates in her memory. “One scientist had been working on developing a product for 10 years when the company pulled the research, saying that it was no longer sustainable. While this was somewhat of a loss for the company, it had devastating effects on the individual.” While this experience did not make her less critical of global corporations, it did teach Ms. Alencar to keep in perspective the individuals who work for these corporations. “I learned that I must respect every single person that works for these corporations.”

On a separate occasion, while visiting with the Shaman Corporation in South San Francisco, Ms. Alencar initiated a discussion on the legal ramifications of clinical testing. The hosts at the corporation were surprised to see that Ms. Alencar had “done her homework” and arrived with a specific agenda for discussion. Although her questioning created a somewhat “uncomfortable environment,” Ms. Alencar feels that she had an impact on the company’s ultimate decision to forego clinical testing. This type of meeting reflects what Ms. Toni summarized as, “Gisela’s unique ability to cut across boundaries and create consensus among stakeholders.”

Taking Risks and Seeking Change

At the end of 1999, seeking change, Ms. Alencar applied for a position with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Brazil office, where she became the Program Officer in charge of the forest portfolio (including the Amazon program) and the global environmental issues portfolio (including alternative energy). This career shift allowed Ms. Alencar a “hands-on managerial experience,” ensuring she would not become “too comfortable” in her position with the National Congress. Ms. Alencar wanted to make certain that she was being constantly challenged and not relying solely on her current knowledge. She was looking to expand her horizons. The move to UNDP came at a very important time in her career and was a “very strategic position.”

When asked whether her Eisenhower Fellowship experience contributed to her decision to move to the UNDP, Ms. Alencar concluded that the new level of self-confidence that she had gained through the fellowship allowed her to take greater risks and seek out change. “My role since the fellowship has changed often and my Eisenhower Fellowship experience has helped me to be more flexible. It gave me the readiness to do different things and took me out of the ‘golden cage’ and expanded my opportunities.” In addition, Ms. Alencar increased her technical expertise, which proved invaluable in working with technicians and energy specialists. “Having gained insight in genetic engineering labs was very helpful in my work with the UNDP and in particular in my travel to the Amazon. I was able to apply my lab experiences and my technical information in my conversations, in a more professional manner.”

the President of the Board. Ms. Toni is an economist, currently working as the Field Officer for the Ford Foundation in Brazil.
Redefining Leadership – Carrying Out the Vision

Ms. Alencar defines a leader as someone who has a clear idea – a defined vision - and who can communicate this vision to others clearly and compellingly. While she viewed herself as a leader prior to her participation in the Eisenhower Fellowships, it was largely because she had been selected by the Rockefeller Foundation to participate in the Leadership for Environment and Development Program from 1991 - 1993.

As a result of her experiences during the Eisenhower fellowship, Ms. Alencar’s opinion of her leadership role changed. The fellowship helped her develop the self-confidence necessary to carry out her vision in the field of environment and environmental law. Ms. Ana Toni summarized, “Gisela is a natural leader, very strong – she is so knowledgeable in her field, one of the few such experts in Brazil. She is so specialized, yet still has the ability to link social justice-related interests to environmental law. We do not have many chances in Brazil to develop such expertise.” Mr. Antonio Benjamim, a long time colleague, shared Ms. Toni’s opinion concluding: “Gisela has contributed greatly to the field of bio-technology regulation and access to bio-genetic resources. I would most certainly say that she is one of the top experts in her field.”

A particularly insightful meeting with Dr. Edward Wilson at the Comparative Zoology Laboratory at Harvard University gave Ms. Alencar the opportunity to analyze, discuss and confirm, or dismiss some of her theories. This meeting directly contributed to her self-confidence and self-perception as a knowledgeable contributor to the field. It also helped her define her vision as an advocate for the voiceless, which she effortlessly summarized in her final report to the Eisenhower Fellowships:

“I remember arriving here saying that I considered myself a lawyer-engineer, building bridges between contending constituencies, but now I can see that I have actually built a bridge of confidence within myself, so I can better advocate the cause of the voiceless: nature, indigenous peoples and traditional communities.”

Overall, discussions and meetings with scholars and experts in her field helped Ms. Alencar to view herself as a valuable asset. Her colleagues at the House of Representatives clearly shared this opinion. Within a year of working for the UNDP, Ms. Alencar was called upon by the Ministry of Environment to be a member of the National Energy Emergency Task Force to address the pending energy crisis in Brazil. After the Task Force, Ms. Alencar remained as the advisor to the Minister of Environment within the House of Representatives. Through February 2003, she served as a General Counsel and Program Director at the Ministry of the Environment.

In addition to her distinction as a sought-after legal advisor, Ms. Alencar also received an increasing number of requests to be a member of boards including lawyers associations and environmental groups. “People were able to see that I was able to be in charge and to be more responsible for these associations.” Again, she attributes this, in part, to her experience as a fellow and the development of her knowledge and her self-confidence. “I was more and more expected to give my opinions on different issues, not only where I worked, but also outside organizations. My readiness and expertise was clear to other individuals.” Ms. Alencar was asked to join the Board of Greenpeace Brazil, which she accepted in 2000. As a member, she was

---

3 Mr. Antonio Benjamim and Ms. Alencar have been colleagues for over 15 years. He is a Senior Public Attorney for the State of Sao Paulo and the founder and Director of the Lawyers for a Green Planet Institute.
actively involved in the management restructuring and campaign planning of the – as Ms. Toni, the President of the Board at the time, quips - “rather controversial” organization.

While many of her professional and civic accomplishments cannot be solely attributed to her experience as an Eisenhower fellow, Ms. Alencar is convinced that she carries the perspectives that she learned in the United States with her everyday. “At the United Nations and through the changes in my career I would not be able to perform 10% of what I did if I had not had the Eisenhower Fellowship experience. It has been fundamental, in all the roles that I have performed including the General Counsel and the Legislative Consultant at the House. Any of these roles would not be the same had I not had the exposure to the ‘test’ that the fellowship offered.”

**Personal Development through Broadened Perspectives**

The fellowship experience broadened her perspective of looking at individuals from different cultures and backgrounds. As she jokingly admitted, this was the second time in her life that she accepted a fellowship from a Republican-oriented organization. “This was the first wall that I had to get over.” Her experience proved that reality is not so monolithic and that she had to keep her curiosity alive and be willing to share. Ultimately, Ms. Alencar was pleased with the responsiveness of the fellowship to her diverse requests. Her meetings confirmed her previous experiences with American society. In her own words, “American society has a specific way of doing things – of giving information, gathering information, and sharing information. The entire process has a lot to do with the way Americans work with others. It was an amazing experience that confirmed that there are wonderful people in America doing wonderful things – something to keep in mind when we hear international opinions about the United States.”

Ms. Alencar’s experience also had a great impact on her career and life goals. A memorable meeting with James Nickel, Professor of the Philosophy of Law at the University of Colorado at Boulder, allowed her to delve deeper into her career ambitions and the impact of the Eisenhower Fellowship on her life. This conversation not only contributed to her sense of confidence and understanding, but also developed into a long-term mentorship and friendship.

Conversations with participating hosts as well as fellowship activities exposed Ms. Alencar to the enormous complexity of the environmental arena. This process helped her realize that the professional and personal goals that she had set for herself were much too ambitious to accomplish in one lifetime. A particular conversation with Dr. Wilson at Harvard University helped her appreciate that she was, “working too much, too hard, and carrying too large of a burden on her shoulders.” She was reminded that she had to live life. In 2003, Ms. Alencar returned to the Office of Legislative Research and Consultancy of the House of Representatives.

While she admitted to trying to maintain a “low profile” since the birth of her third child, Ms. Alencar was appointed to be the House’s Legal Advisor to the Rapporteur of the Congressional Joint Committee on Money Laundering and International Financial Crimes in March of 2003. Most recently, driven by her desire to make a more effective contribution to international institutions and enhance global cooperation, she has submitted her application to a number of international organizations that are recruiting international lawyers. The outcome of this process is still pending.

**Value of the Network**

Since the fellowship, Ms. Alencar admits that she has many more and higher-level professional contacts, although she does not attribute this solely to the experience. Nonetheless, the confidence
that the fellowship instilled in her has helped her overcome her reservations and shyness and has directly contributed to her ability to meet and contact various persons. “I had been doing that before (the fellowship), but I was shy – not so confident.” As Mr. Benjamim, summarized: “The single point that I remember her stressing upon her return, was the incredible networking opportunity that the fellowship provided.”

The experience of meeting the other 14 Brazilian fellows and their spouses was a unique and wonderful opportunity. “Spending a total of about three weeks together, throughout the period of the fellowship, was very interesting.” There was only one other fellow from her field, so meeting individuals with such diverse interests from all parts of Brazil was unique. Ultimately, Ms. Alencar has maintained a very close relationship with one of the fellows that she met through the program. She and Ms. Marlova J. Noleto have shared many professional and personal experiences.

In terms of a formal alumni network, Ms. Alencar has been the President and Vice-President of a Brazilian Eisenhower Fellows Alumni network, but admittedly, the initiative was not sustainable. Today, the alumni network is much more informal and evolves mainly around nominating new Eisenhower Fellows. The last time that Ms. Alencar traveled to meet with fellow alumni was almost two years ago, although email contact is quite frequent.

Professionally, Ms. Alencar uses the Eisenhower network in Brazil when she is planning events or looking for speakers on specific topics. Of the individuals who she met in the United States, Ms. Alencar maintains contact with a select few – mostly professors and personal mentors. In the past, she has called upon individuals from various NGOs in Washington, DC and members of the World Bank. Her contacts with the World Bank were particularly helpful for her work with the United Nations.

Ms. Alencar does not use the Intra-Ike database that is available to the Eisenhower alumni. She says that she does not think of the database as an online resource and that she would be more likely to use Google or call the EF office if she needed information. To improve the connectedness of Eisenhower fellows, Ms. Alencar offered an example of a particularly useful listserv that she belongs to as part of an international environmental lawyers network. “I do belong to a listserv – there is a person hired specifically to connect the network and monitor the listserv. Since there is a specific contact person, and she is very good at disseminating interesting information, I always follow up to change my contact information with her.”

**Sharing Knowledge and New Perspectives**

While Ms. Alencar did not host any formal information sharing sessions about her experience as an Eisenhower Fellow, she incorporated her newly acquired expertise in all of the meetings, presentations and conferences that she attended thereafter. In attending these meetings, Ms. Alencar believed she was one of the few people who felt confident discussing a range of topics in bio safety and environmental change. She has been able to contribute to conversations and share her experience both nationally (in Brazil) and internationally. Ms. Alencar feels she has earned greater respect and credibility among colleagues by having discussed (and approved) her theories with the distinguished individuals she met during her fellowship. Mr. Benjamim confirms her feeling, concluding that “upon her return, Gisela was able to talk about issues with greater depth and knowledge.”
Looking Ahead

At the global meeting of Eisenhower fellows in Spain in 1998, Ms. Alencar noted that most of the members were “conventional” leaders marked by wealth and power. This opinion is in contrast to her perception of the Brazilian Eisenhower Fellows participating in the 1996 Single-Nation program. Ms. Alencar feels that within the Brazilian group, there was a good balance of leaders representing the for-profit and civil society, reflecting an adequate diversity of leadership styles.

With her vision of leadership in mind, Ms. Alencar urges the Eisenhower Fellowships to create more diversity among the types of leaders chosen for the program. In the closing of her report about the fellowship, Ms. Alencar said that during the eight-week period, she had tried to portray the type of leader that Dwight D. Eisenhower described as “a woman of vision, integrity, courage and understanding, who has the power of articulation, and profundity of character.” This is the type of leader that she hopes will continue to be represented among future Eisenhower fellows, and she urges a greater range of professions among the program’s fellows.
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An authority in poverty and education, Ms. Bordon directs social policy analysis for a leading research institute. While in the U.S., she will investigate the links between organizations that influence policy, such as think tanks and NGOs, and different branches of the U.S. government. Campaign finance and public accountability are also areas of Fellowship inquiry for her. Involved in politics since her youth, she participated actively in her husband’s presidential, gubernatorial, and legislative campaigns. Ms. Bordon, who will remain in a position to influence policy, is strongly committed to achieving a consolidated democratic system in her country.

Fellowship Experience

Ms. Bordon viewed the Eisenhower fellowship as an opportunity to broaden her understanding of the third sector in the United States. In addition, it was a chance for her to further explore some of her many interests including unemployment policies, poverty measures, polling and the links between academia and policy making in the United States. At the time of her nomination, Ms. Bordon was a sociology professor at the Universidad Nacional de Cuyo in Mendoza, Argentina and the Director of the Social Department at the Instituto de Economia y Organizacion – a public policy think tank specializing in public opinion surveys. Ms. Bordon’s goal as an Eisenhower fellow was to enrich her professional work and transfer her new knowledge to Argentine institutions. She met with representatives from three types of institutions: nonprofits, think tanks and legal institutions that ensure transparency in the public realm (such as the Council on Foundations).

During an intense eight-week period Ms. Bordon traveled to over 15 cities in nearly as many states. She visited numerous nonprofit organizations including the Pew Charitable Trusts, Howard Gilman Foundation, Center for the Study of Philanthropy, Manhattan Institute, The Foundation Center, Freedom Forum Media Studies Center, Urban Institute, Brookings Institute, Citizen Action, Cato Institute, World Bank, Civicus, and the National Center for Policy Analysis. Ms. Bordon also met with researchers and experts in policy and poverty related fields at leading universities including the University of Pennsylvania, Bryn Mawr College, Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Brown University, Johns Hopkins University, University of Denver, University of California in Los Angeles, University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Northwestern University.

Senator Jose Octavio Bordon, Ms. Bordon’s husband, accompanied her for the duration of the trip and attended several of the above-mentioned meetings. Mr. Bordon also had an independent
agenda prepared by their Eisenhower program officer, which consisted largely of meetings with
individuals working on Latin American policy reform and media representatives.

The Bordons also attended a conference sponsored by the National Council on Public Polls and
visited with executives from Roper Starch Worldwide, a renowned public opinion polling
company. Both Ms. and Mr. Bordon were happy with the diversity of the visits and the quality of
their conversations. Particularly memorable for Ms. Bordon were her visits to the Institute for
Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the Urban Institute, and the
National Academy of Sciences in Washington, DC.

Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

Ms. Bordon treated her Eisenhower experience as an information gathering opportunity rather
than a personal development trip. “It is a matter of age – I was one of the oldest fellows, past the
difficult part of my career. I was already well established. For younger people the experience
may contribute to their self-confidence and risk-taking. I had taken all of my risks. For me, the
fellowship yielded more assets and tools.” She says the experience did little to affect her career
path and leadership role. It did, however, benefit her work by exposing her to new methodologies
and research in her field. “The fellowship affected my career by making me richer with tools,
methodologies, values and mission.” Ms. Bordon collected important insight from American
researchers about new poverty measures and econometric methodologies used to define poverty
lines. She was also exposed to cutting-edge research around female-headed households and
poverty levels associated with this family structure. In addition, one of the key concepts that Ms.
Bordon learned was the notion of transparency. The prevalence of openness and information
sharing in all of her meetings inspired Ms. Bordon to pursue collaborative working models upon
her return to Argentina.

Aside from gaining a considerable amount of practical knowledge, Ms. Bordon also enjoyed
getting to know the numerous international fellows. Her husband, who accompanied Ms. Bordon
throughout the trip, benefited greatly from the contacts that he made during EF and continues to
draw on these contacts in his current position as Ambassador of Argentina to the United States.

New Perspectives

Before the fellowship, Ms. Bordon was particularly interested in the relationship between
academia and think tanks working in the social sciences, and how these institutions influence
policies to improve the lives of people. Having spent a substantial amount of time working in the
university system and conducting research at a university-affiliated think tank, Ms. Bordon was
interested in examining these institutions and how they contribute to the policy discussion in the
United States. As she recalls, her meetings at Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania,
and Bryn Mawr College exemplified the strong relationships between academia, politics and
public policy. “I saw the way that it was done in the United States. It was important for me to
see that the model that I was thinking about and trying to implement in Argentina was being done
in another reality.” The experience increased her interest in making connections between
universities, think tanks, and policy makers even stronger in Argentina.

4 Ms. Bordon worked as the Director of the Social Department at the Instituto de Economía y Organización
– a think tank researching unemployment, poverty and social public policies that is affiliated with the
University of Mendoza.
In her many meetings with high-level staff of the third sector, Ms. Bordon recognized that accountability was a “general methodology that is part of the [American and institutional] culture.” A few years after the fellowship, Ms. Bordon moved to Buenos Aires to work with the Ministry of Education. At the time, the idea of transparency was foreign in Argentina – it was not common practice to openly share information and processes among institutions. “I was working as a team leader to develop an information system. I had the opportunity and the ability to use all the technical methodologies that I had learned, but more importantly I implemented a series of accountability measures. I changed the way that information was managed.” Ms. Bordon made great efforts to ensure that the information management project was a collaboration of numerous ministries, agencies, and organizations. In effect, Ms. Bordon contributed to a change in the organizational culture.

Ms. Jorgelina Seminario worked with Ms. Bordon at the Ministry of Education from 2001 to 2003. When asked about her impressions of Ms. Bordon and the work she had conducted at the Ministry, Ms. Seminario concluded: “The most important thing is that she developed a new technology in a contradictory environment and opened a lot of minds in the process – many people were not interested in changing the organizational culture and [thanks to her they] discovered the importance of the new technology. She made them re-think their ideas.” Ms. Seminario deduced that the Eisenhower experience contributed to the information exchange process that Ms. Bordon managed. In conversations, Ms. Bordon often referenced her Fellowship meetings and, according to Ms. Seminario, “it is thanks to the Fellowship that Monica incurred the knowledge and the information to implement these ideas.”

Ms. Elvira Romera, also a colleague from the Ministry of Education, shares these impressions. According to Ms. Romera, Ms. Bordon made a very important contribution to the educational system in Argentina by establishing this information system and database to track individual students’ education history and personal information. The internet-based system, which is available to all internet users in order to track performance indicators by school and to cross-examine these indicators with poverty measures of the community, is truly ground-breaking in Argentina. Ms. Romera also mentioned that Ms. Bordon trained over 100 staff members to ensure that all of the innovations that she introduced in the Ministry were sustainable. According to Ms. Romera, the data collection system revolutionized the planning and allocation of scarce resources and had an impact on the entire educational system of the province – it may soon be expanded to the entire country. Ms. Romera credits Ms. Bordon with introducing the idea of equal access to information, or as she stated – the “democratization of information” in Argentina. In this sense, Ms. Romera concluded, “Monica is a leader and an innovator.”

During her fellowship, Ms. Bordon quickly realized the complexity of the third sector structure in the United States and created a set of parameters that she used to better understand it. She stated: “The practical performance of institutions is shaped by the social context within which they operate… Interaction between institutional change and leaders in important.” Ms. Bordon not only returned to Argentina with a new approach to reshaping the social context, but she also accepted a lead role in facilitating this change in her professional environment.

---

5 Ms. Elvira Romera is currently a consultant at the Ministry of Education. She met Ms. Bordon through Mr. Bordon, when he was the Minister of Education for the Province of Buenos Aires. Ms. Romera and Ms. Bordon collaborated on a number of projects and became close friends. They keep in touch regularly.
**Applied Knowledge**

“I had the opportunity to meet the most important researchers on poverty in this country and it was a tremendous learning experience.” Ms. Bordon obtained new poverty measurement tools and had numerous discussions with researchers about the reformulation of the methodology used to establish the poverty line. “I was able to learn about the mistakes that they are correcting and the problems that they are facing with this methodology.” These meetings proved particularly helpful upon her return to Mendoza, where Ms. Bordon reworked the poverty line for the region. She also worked with the Province of Buenos Aires to develop a set of poverty indicators. The tools and methodologies that she learned about at the University of Wisconsin and the National Academy of Sciences proved to be very valuable for these assignments.

During her visit, Ms. Bordon attended a convention of pollsters in New York City. The conference was about ethics, polling, and establishing accountability. As a member of the Argentine Association of Pollsters, Ms. Bordon implemented some of the polling methods that she learned about at the conference and in her meetings with Roper Starch Worldwide.

Overall, Ms. Bordon concluded that all of the things that she learned in the United States are applicable across many disciplines. “I was able to apply the things that I learned in new areas of my work.” Her newly acquired skills were applicable not only in working with nonprofits, but also in working with the Province of Buenos Aires and other stakeholders. While neither Ms. Bordon nor her husband held formal presentations or lectures about their EF experience, the ideas, values and techniques that they learned were shared in informal meetings, working groups, and conversations. According to Ms. Romera, Ms. Bordon shared her knowledge through the presentations that she made concerning the database. She also made a huge effort to apply the participatory approach that she had observed as a fellow to all of her initiatives by changing the way that schools and the Ministry of Education work together. She contacted the information departments of several universities and trained the clerks (most of whom were without academic degrees) to enter data and send it to the Ministry. By doing so, Ms. Bordon created a high degree of compliance with data collection and data entry and introduced the value of collaboration among clerks, teachers, principals and Ministry employees.

**Networks**

Since 1997, Ms. Bordon and her husband have been very mobile – having moved back and forth to the United States twice. Amidst all of the travel and relocations, Ms. Bordon has pursued numerous career opportunities and engagements. She confesses that she suffers from “a problem of identity – I am not sure if I am the Ambassador’s wife or if I am myself.” Given their mobility, Ms. Bordon regrets that she has not been able to maintain contact with all of the individuals who she met in the United States, although she did at one point return to the United States and meet with researchers from a Washington, DC-based think tank to discuss her work with poverty indicators.

Ms. Bordon’s husband has maintained greater contact with the individuals he met during the fellowship. Not only did he gain more and higher level contacts than he had before, but he has been able to leverage all of the contacts he made. In fact, Ms. Bordon attributes her husband’s current position as Ambassador directly to the Eisenhower fellowship experience. “The fellowship influenced my husband’s career more than my own.”
As well traveled as Mr. and Ms. Bordon are, a real highlight of the fellowship was the opportunity to meet the other international fellows. “Spending a longer period [of time] with different people from different countries was a really great experience – it was more than a few hours with someone… The fellowship gave us the opportunity to interact with such a diverse group.” The fellowship was a chance to better understand the diverse cultures and fields of interest of the others – this was a welcome change from the short, superficial meetings that Ms. Bordon was accustomed to in her international travel. The Eisenhower interaction allowed her to delve deeply into discussions and get first-hand thorough exposure to many different cultures and values. As Ms. Seminario stated, “the fellowship experience was not only educational, but it was interesting socially and in terms of cultural development as well as personal improvement.”
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In 1994, South Africa’s Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) was generating major investment in the country’s infrastructure. At LTA Civil and Earthworks, Mr. Danana was responsible for deciding investment policy in the areas of waste disposal, toll road financing and construction, low-income housing, and small to medium-sized business development. Mr. Danana’s goal is to link RDP contractors with smaller, regional firms that help execute the national plan. During his Eisenhower Fellowship, Mr. Danana will investigate the methods of attracting financing for infrastructure projects within both public and private sectors.

Fellowship Experience

The Eisenhower Fellowships experience came about at a critical time both personally and professionally for John Sembie Danana. In the months prior to participating in the Eisenhower Fellowships, Mr. Danana accepted the position of General Manager for Investments at LTA Civil and Earthworks Division, LTA, Ltd. and moved his family from a serene rural community to a bustling urban center. In spite of the many professional and personal transitions taking place in his life at this time, Mr. Danana, his family, and employer all realized that this was a once-in-a-lifetime experience and was not to be missed.

The focus of Mr. Danana’s fellowship was to gain insights on investing in the future infrastructure development of South Africa, particularly in the areas of waste management, toll highway construction and financing, public/private enterprise cooperation, and housing strategies. During the fellowship, Mr. Danana engaged in almost 40 meetings, visiting over 30 institutions in the private and public sectors. In the span of eight weeks, he traveled to over 20 cities in 16 states in a whirlwind of informative meetings and site visits.

Some of the most notable private sector meetings were with executives from Waste Management Technologies, 3M Corporation, IREX, and the Seattle Solid Waste Utility, where Mr. Danana learned of innovations and advancements in waste management. Mr. Danana was particularly impressed with his site visits to Dulles Greenway – a 100% privately financed toll road outside of Washington, D.C., and SR-91, a private road built on a public highway in Orange County, CA. During these site visits, Mr. Danana came to the revelation that, “there are no such things as free roads,” meaning that for infrastructure to be effective, there has to be a premium for its use.

During his fellowship, Mr. Danana also participated in the Annual Conference of the International Bridge, Tunnel, and Turnpike Association meeting in Orlando, FL, where one of the many topics addressed was public/private partnerships for the financing and maintenance of roads. His meetings with several top New York Investment Bank executives at Lehman Brothers,
Paine Webber, and Smith Barney added additional perspectives to his learning. Mr. Danana’s meetings with executives from the Liebman Melting Partnership in New York, NY; Black & Veatch in Kansas City, MO; and the Harris County Housing Authority in Houston, TX addressed the issue of housing development and financing.

Mr. Danana also met with professors and researchers from the State University of New York’s Office of Research and Economic Development, University of Michigan’s School of Business Administration, and the University of Massachusetts’ School of Management. During these visits, Mr. Danana addressed a number of issues ranging from management training of new hires, to creating partnerships with South African universities, to increasing the level of management training.

### Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

Given the drastic political changes occurring in South Africa in 1994 and the pending deluge of foreign investment that was to follow, the infrastructure issues that Mr. Danana focused on during his fellowship were critical to his country’s development. As mentioned above, in an effort to better position himself to address these issues, Mr. Danana made a shift in his professional career prior to participating in the Eisenhower Fellowships. He left his position as General Manager of Aviation at the state-owned Transkei Airlines to become the General Manager of Investments at LTA Civil and Earthworks Division. Given this shift, the personal and professional impact of the Eisenhower Fellowship on Mr. Danana was significant. One of the most compelling quotes from Mr. Danana came from his response to the question, “What was the highlight of the Eisenhower fellowship experience?” He replied, “The program itself was a highlight because [it] marshaled me into a world that I was interested in getting involved in but didn’t know exactly how to access or fully understand.”

The most overarching impact was the way that the fellowship broadened Mr. Danana’s perspective, particularly as it relates to how organizations can partner to obtain maximum results. The fellowship experience also expanded Mr. Danana’s professional areas of expertise, exposing him to new ways of approaching operational safety standards, research and evaluation, and public/private financing. On a personal level, participating in Eisenhower Fellowship strengthened Mr. Danana’s resolve and bolstered his confidence in proposing new ways to approach infrastructure development in South Africa. Finally, as a participant in the Eisenhower Fellowships Single Nation Program, Mr. Danana was introduced to a new cadre of progressive South African professionals, who were unknown to him prior to the fellowship.

### Broadened Perspective: A New Way to Work

In 1994, South Africa’s economy could have been described as a Third World economy, according to Mr. Danana. Visiting the U.S. made the difference in scale seem astounding! The high usage of roads and the need for more complex waste management systems in the United States exposed Mr. Danana to new perspectives, concepts, techniques, and information that were urgently needed in South Africa.

Mr. Danana found the concept of identifying and dedicating specific funds to finance infrastructure projects intriguing. For instance, during the fellowship he was exposed to road infrastructure financed through taxes on gas; bridges and highways built through tolls; and water treatment plants, utilities, stadiums, public utility projects, and housing financed through various
kinds of state or municipal bonds. These visits contributed to Mr. Danana’s further consideration of how, in South Africa, this kind of financing could relieve the general fund of the government, which is derived primarily from income taxes, to pay for other socially related issues such as job creation, education, and health.

The steady evolution of scientific techniques and community-based approaches in waste management further broadened Mr. Danana’s perspective. During his visits to waste management facilities in Illinois, Mr. Danana was exposed to the emergence of the composting industry, an outgrowth of the increased focus on recycling, through a project that was being developed to turn methane gas from landfills into electricity. He also found that at every level the issues around waste were being discussed and potential solutions debated. Corporations had come to understand the rewards of engaging communities on issues such as pollution of natural resources and recycling.

Mr. Danana found that public and private sector cooperation was an area that was still emerging in the United States and was severely underutilized in South Africa. He found that, “previously, in the United States, it was taken for granted that roads were to be free, but the traffic congestion proved to be both irritating and hazardous. However, capital improvements needed to improve and alleviate the traffic flow on these roads proved to be more than the government coffers could bear.” Therefore, the private sector notion of user-fees was introduced and embraced by governments and eventually led to the development of self-financing roads and bridges. Again, these concepts and techniques influenced the way that Mr. Danana approached his work in South Africa. He adopted the mantra, “there are no free roads,” as a way to capture the idea that for any infrastructure to be effective, there must be some premium that the public is willing to pay. Mr. Danana found that the tolling practices at Dulles Greenway, in Orange County, and in Washington State were particularly influential in developing his ideas about the way that he would like to see his company progress. Once he returned home, Mr. Danana served an advisor to a group at LTA that was eventually awarded a major toll concession project.

During his fellowship, Mr. Danana had the opportunity to share some of his new perspectives with colleagues while attending the International Bridge, Tunnel, and Turnpike Association conference in Orlando, Florida. At the meeting, some initial groundwork was laid for how the group could transfer emerging ideas into their work in South Africa.

**Evolving as a Leader**

As a senior executive at LTA Civil and Earthworks Division, LTA, Ltd., Mr. Danana was already well established before his fellowship experience. However, in the months and years following his return from the fellowship, Mr. Danana noticed that he was becoming increasingly engaged by his colleagues to weigh in on the development of contracts and provide advice and oversight to major infrastructure projects. He was also receiving requests to sit on the governing boards of major South African institutions.

It is possible that many of these things would have occurred in spite of Mr. Danana’s participation in the Eisenhower Fellowship; however, Mr. Danana feels that the exposure to new techniques and concepts, as well as his broadened perspective, instilled in him greater confidence to risk introducing new ideas and approaches to the way work is done in South Africa.

Following the awarding of the toll concession contract, Mr. Danana’s opinion and advice was sought on a more consistent basis due to the fact that his colleagues appreciated the fresh
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perspective that he brought to their work. Immediately following the fellowship, Mr. Danana pursued investment opportunities with the American Roads and Transportation Building Association, Black & Veatch, BHP Minerals, and Western Wood Products Association with a view of developing similar industries within the African continent.

Mr. Danana believes that the international recognition and exposure that comes with being an Eisenhower Fellow alumnus has opened many doors and greatly increased his personal and professional networks. For example, Mr. Reginald Ngcobo, who was a member of the 1994 South Africa SNP cohort, invited Mr. Danana to serve as the Chairman of the Council of Technikon Pretoria (the largest residential university in Southern Africa) after meeting him through their participation with the Eisenhower Fellowships. Mr. Ngcobo stated that although he and Mr. Danana were in totally different fields of work, he was able to glean from their discussions during the Eisenhower Fellowship sessions that Mr. Danana was forward thinking and possessed the natural leadership skills necessary in moving South Africa into the post-Apartheid era.

**Expanded Network**

Participating in the Eisenhower fellowship as a part of the Single Nation Program expanded Mr. Danana’s personal and professional network on a national and international basis. Prior to the Eisenhower fellowship, Mr. Danana did not have any affiliation with the other members of his cohort. However, after sharing this very rich and unique experience with his South African cohort and other Eisenhower fellows around the world, Mr. Danana has been able to build an international network of personal and professional acquaintances that over the years has proven to be very rewarding.

Mr. Danana shared that, when traveling abroad, he is now able to access the Eisenhower fellowship database and arrange meetings, dinners, and/or site-visits with Eisenhower fellows virtually anywhere in the world. He can also find out from the Eisenhower Fellowship database what types of projects or initiatives Eisenhower Fellows are engaged in that may be relevant to the work that he is pursuing in South Africa. In South Africa, Mr. Danana and Mr. Mthembeni Mkize, a member of his fellowship cohort and Chairperson of the local Eisenhower fellowship alumni group in South Africa, are partnering in the development of a manufacturing company in their community, from which they hope to stimulate job creation and increase local ownership.

**A Time of Change**

For Mr. Danana, the Eisenhower fellowship experience served as a catalyst for personal and professional transformations during a time when his country, South Africa, was also experiencing deep and significant transitions. Mr. Danana credits the Eisenhower fellowship with grounding his career path by expanding his areas of expertise. In the years following the Eisenhower fellowship, Mr. Danana became the Manager of Business Development at LTA Construction, Ltd. and then accepted a position as the Commercial Manager at N3 Toll Concession, Ltd. Following that, Mr. Danana applied his broadened perspective, new concepts, and approaches to the gold mining industry in South Africa, where he took a position as the Executive Safety and Quality Assurance Manager at Harmony Gold. He is planning to return to the infrastructure and construction development industry in the near future.

In summing up his fellowship experience, Mr. Danana stated, “I found the fellowship to be an experience that only comes around once in a lifetime. It served to rejuvenate and crystallize my
thoughts in a short space of time. Most of all, the trip taught me that change is a tough and painful experience. Change needs strong leadership, commitment, conviction to the cause, and most of all, effective communication of the vision for the future.”
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Ms. Khan is nationally recognized as an expert on women and development, and is largely responsible for integrating women into Bangladesh’s mainstream development plans. She applied for the Eisenhower fellowship to learn how US organizations and leaders improve the legal, economic and political status of women, and to learn about the policy strategies developed by international research institutions and UN agencies to promote women in economic development.

Fellowship Experience

During her Eisenhower fellowship, Salma Khan traveled to 25 cities in 19 states and had 62 appointments – all in 11 weeks! “I had the opportunity [to meet] renowned experts, acclaimed academicians, committed social workers, persuasive lobbyists, aggressive politicians as well as grass roots workers and officials in state and federal agencies,” she reports. Her itinerary covered many dimensions of the women’s advocacy infrastructure at the state, national and international levels. “My program officer did an excellent job designing my program. [She gave] the right focus on the issues and topics,” says Ms. Khan. Her appointments included meetings with leaders of lobbying and advocacy organizations like the National Organization for Women (NOW), the League of Women Voters, and the Feminist Majority Foundation. She learned about small organizations and non-profits in the Southwest that have introduced numerous bills in state legislatures to promote and protect women’s rights. Ms. Khan was struck by the work of organizations focused on women of color, including the New York Asian Women’s Center and the American Indian Women’s Association.

Local organizations like Women’s Enterprise Resource Center in Philadelphia and WomenVenture in Minneapolis were helpful to Ms. Khan in generating ideas for poverty alleviation. She also met with directors of international organizations focused on women and/or economic development – for example, the Center for Women’s Global Leadership, International Women’s Tribune Center, and the International Center for Research on Women. Other meetings included the UN Economic and Social Commission, the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), and the US Agency for International Development.

Ms. Khan gained awareness of the variety of women’s issues by meeting with organizations focused on different issues – labor rights, domestic violence, and the environment. She held appointments with directors and academics in research and resource centers based in academic and non-academic settings. Examples include the Center for American Women and Politics (Rutgers University), the National Council for Research on Women (New York) and the Center for the Study of Women and Society (City University of New York). She even met with officials at the US Department of State, Office of Human Rights and Women’s Affairs and with journalists at USA Today and at Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting.
Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

Early in her career, Ms. Khan did not really see herself as a leader. But she knew that her inquisitive, vocal nature and innate sense of equity set her apart. “I was always doing things that were different than what women traditionally did,” she explains, “I would participate in debates and discussions and give talks on radio programs.” By the time the Eisenhower Fellowship opportunity came her way, she had left her “comfortable teaching position” in the Department of Economics at the University of Chittagong in Bangladesh to serve for 18 years as the first female policymaker on the Government of Bangladesh’s Planning Commission. Ms. Khan began her policy career with a broad but clear vision. “I wanted to prove that women were agents of economic development,” she explains, and “I wanted my voice to matter.”

When asked about the highlights of her fellowship experience, Ms. Khan exclaimed, “the whole thing!” Though relatively short, the experience was, in many ways, a sharp turning point in her life. Ms. Khan was careful to point out that no single EF activity affected her work or life. Rather, the entire experience led to almost seismic shifts in her thinking, generating tremors of change that continue today in Bangladesh and on a global scale. Now an internationally and nationally recognized human rights leader and activist, Ms. Khan believes that the fellowship added to her self-confidence, significantly broadened her perspective of women’s issues, and drew out her innate (though nascent) feminist consciousness. The experience also led her to international activism, which has helped expand the scope of her work in Bangladesh.

Building Confidence

“The Eisenhower fellowship certainly added to my self-confidence,” says Ms. Khan. Given her position at the time at the time of selection, acceptance into the fellowship program was validating in and of itself. “I was the youngest [in my department], the only woman in my department, and it was very early in my career track,” says Ms. Khan.

Despite these challenges (or maybe because of them), Ms. Khan approached her fellowship with a great sense of responsibility. “I realized I’m representing my own country. I have to project an image of my own country as an ambassador of goodwill. I was given an opportunity to learn, but at every interview, questions were asked about my country and me. This was a unique opportunity to represent my whole country and culture. There are many misconceptions about Bangladesh.” Talking about herself and her country to high-level leaders helped Ms. Khan further cultivate one of her natural talents. “The fellowship was very helpful in honing my public speaking skills,” she says. Meeting with high-level leaders and organizations of considerable caliber also added to Ms. Khan’s sense of confidence. “This was very big for me…I was thrilled to meet with organizations of such stature – that have done so much already,” she notes.

A Broadening and Transformative Experience

Prior to the fellowship, Ms. Khan addressed women’s issues under a limited purview. “At that time, I only addressed women’s issues from the lens of economic development – better jobs and better wages. I never thought about women’s political rights.” Through her Eisenhower Fellowship, Ms. Khan acquired several new lenses for understanding women’s issues. Meeting with a wide variety of US leaders and women’s organizations profoundly expanded her knowledge of the ways in which cultural, social and political forces shape women’s lives. “Before, I had no idea of the diversity of women’s issues,” she says. “In just a few weeks of time,
I learned of all the different areas we have to work [to improve women’s lives].” She was introduced to areas like women and the environment, domestic violence, and women’s political participation, and learned about the unique sets of issues facing minority women. So compelled by her new understanding, Ms. Khan wrote a book about the diversity of women’s issues, *Fifty Percent: Women in Development and Policy*.

Meeting and talking with women leaders helped Ms. Khan give voice to her ideas. “Before, I was thinking about these issues on a subdued level. Now, I could think about these issues out loud, and [I felt that] I was not alone.” Ms. Khan also came to understand that discrimination against women is ubiquitous, a reality that stretches across borders. “I learned how much women are discriminated against even in developed countries. I thought it was only in South Asia that things were bad.”

Oppression’s vast reach was not all that Ms. Khan came to comprehend. She also learned about new frameworks for change and justice. “This was my first exposure to a whole slew of women’s rights….Within a very short time, I learned about women’s rights as human rights.” The notion that women have “rights in all spheres of life,” combined with her heightened understanding of oppression, sparked another transformation in Ms. Khan’s evolution. “This experience made me a feminist…It was the beginning.”

**New Opportunities for Leadership and Activism**

“I’m now widely known in my country,” says Ms. Khan, “Eisenhower fellowships started the process.” Ms. Khan was always a prolific writer, contributing to numerous academic and professional journals. When she arrived back from her fellowship, she expanded her communications capacity to discuss women’s issues and reach a much broader, non-academic audience. “My office gave me formal leave to write about my fellowship experience. That got me started on writing in newspaper columns. I now do this on a regular basis.”

The breadth and scope of knowledge and perspective that Ms. Khan gained during her fellowship is mirrored not only in her writing, but in all of the work she has pursued since the fellowship. Within a year after the fellowship, Ms. Khan was elected as an expert in the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the monitoring body of the “world’s most comprehensive legally binding treaty on women’s human rights.”

Ms. Khan’s progression to the UN was directly tied to her Eisenhower experience. She came to know about the convention and its nomination procedures during one of her Eisenhower appointments, a meeting with the Asia Program Officer at the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). After sharing this knowledge with her colleagues in government, Ms. Khan received a nomination to compete in the closely contested election of CEDAW Committee held at the UN Headquarters in New York. She has served as a CEDAW member since 1993. Since then, she has been elected to the committee three times (she is now serving her third term). In 1997, she was the first Asian Chairperson elected. She is also founder of the CEDAW Forum – an “action and lobby group for full implementation of the Women’s Convention.” Her work on CEDAW includes promoting and monitoring compliance of treaty obligations relating to the human rights of women, and traveling worldwide as a spokesperson, weaving together human rights, women’s rights and sustainable development.

The Eisenhower experience, says Ms. Khan, “changed me as a person…I had to leave my job to devote more time to human rights activism.” Ms. Khan eventually left the planning commission.
to become a full-time activist and human rights expert, a step that seems to have amplified her voice and help spread a vision of human rights on a much broader scale. Now serving on several national and international bodies, Ms. Khan plays a vital role, building, generating and connecting these global and domestic institutions and networks to leverage greater impact. In addition to her work on CEDAW, she is a board member of Women for Women, a research and public education group focused on Bangladeshi women. She is currently the Chairperson and Project Coordinator of the NGO Coalition on Implementation of Beijing Platform for Action (NCBP), a coalition created to ensure that governments and NGOs uphold the concerns of women in Bangladesh and comply with CEDAW treaty obligations. Ms. Khan’s unifying presence and organizing influence in the coalition is clear. Women for Women was selected as the Secretariat of NCPB, which has attracted 600 NGOs from all over Bangladesh.

Ms. Khan describes herself today as an “international resource,” traveling abroad on a regular basis to give talks and provide technical assistance and training on applying human rights regulations and frameworks on a local level. The talks and resources she offers today reflect the diversity of women’s issues she was exposed to years earlier during her fellowship. “I am a resource on reproductive health, gender and development, education, and violence against women.” In her earlier years, she adds, “government approached women as beneficiaries, not as having rights.” Today, her talks reflect rights-based framework. “Just as we see reproductive [health] as a right, development is also a right, not a benefit,” she explains.

**Networks for Sharing Knowledge**

Ms. Khan says that, at the time of her fellowship, she developed strong bonds and personal friendships with some fellows in her cohort. However, more than 10 years later, she currently has minimal contact with those fellows, or with others in the Eisenhower Fellowships alumni network. She said that she uses the alumni network to help her with small matters (i.e., logistical issues related to travel), at most.

Ms. Khan reported that she feels more connected with some of the organizations she met during her fellowship. For example, Ms. Khan exchanges information and knowledge with organizations like NOW and the Feminist Majority Foundation. “We share information on challenges and achievements,” she notes. This might include information about new models for addressing domestic violence, or strategies to sensitize governments on gendered budgeting. She goes on to explain, “Given the kind of work I do, I need information on strategies and best practices.”

**In Closing**

Ms. Khan points to her Eisenhower fellowship as an experience that “opened such a wide horizon.” Through the experience, she developed an acute sense of the need and the vision for improving all aspects of women’s lives. Twelve years later, the fellowship’s transformative impact continues as Ms. Khan works with both governments and communities to develop a more holistic vision of development and human rights for women.

Working for human rights on a broad, international scale, Ms. Khan is careful in defining what it means to be a national leader. Ms. Khan describes herself as a nationalist leader in a sense that she is dedicated to the development of Bangladesh and the human rights of Bangladeshi women. “But as a human rights activist,” she explains, “I’m also not a nationalist that will do anything for my country. The work has to be good...[it cannot occur] at a cost to others.”
With such an encompassing perspective, Ms. Khan is considered one of the women leaders in Bangladesh. “I’ve been recognized as a leader at a level where people in my country normally do not [recognize women],” she says. Gaining this stature occurred with “time and age,” says Ms. Khan. Reflecting a little further, she adds, “I’ve communicated greatly. I feel that I’ve gained a lot of respect for that.” But she also acknowledges that she’s had an edge. “I realized later in [my] life that I’m a little more aware, I’ve had more challenges and achievements. I know part of this is due to Eisenhower [Fellowships].”
Patricia (Trisha) Lester
North Carolina
USA Fellow, 2003

Profile at Time of EF Participation

Appointed Vice President of the North Carolina Center for Nonprofits in 1999, Trisha Lester, 47, is responsible for the implementation and conceptualization of a number of programs and services for this statewide nonprofit. She leads the Center’s work on the design, planning, and execution of her organization’s annual statewide conference; handles collaborative projects with national, statewide, and local partners; oversees the Center’s information and referral services; and leads special projects such as “Standards for Excellence: A Self-Help Tool for Nonprofits’ Organizational Effectiveness.” She is interested in the Triangle’s growing Hispanic and Latino community and is on the board of directors of the Latino Community Development Center, a new statewide nonprofit. Ms. Lester will visit South America to meet with representatives from non-governmental and civil society organizations to better understand the commonalities and differences in organizational and leadership issues between organizations in the U.S. and Latin American countries.

Fellowship Experience

Trisha Lester’s recent Eisenhower fellowship (Nov. – Dec. 2003) took her to Argentina, Bolivia, and Perú to meet with nonprofit organizations and investigate the challenges and successes that the nonprofit sector in Latin America faces. In Argentina, she met with representatives from organizations including Programa Desarrollo Social y Sociedad Civil (the University of San Andres’ Social Development and Civil Society Program), Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas Para La Equidad y el Crecimiento (Center for the Implementation of Public Policies for Equity and Growth), and Ciudadanos Por El Cambio (Citizens for Change). In Perú, she met with the Consorcio de Investigacion Economica y Social (Consortium for Economics and Social Research), Asociacion de Desarrollo de la Educacion y la Salud (Association for the Development of Health and Education), and Instituto Cultural Peruano Norteamericano (the Peruvian/American Cultural Institute).

Trisha had lived in Bolivia previously, and it was by special arrangement that she returned to the country during her Eisenhower fellowship. She said that Bolivia was not on the list of EF countries that she was given to choose from, but that EF staff were accommodating of her request to travel there. She had meetings with nonprofits including Fundacion Amigos de la Naturaleza (Friends of Nature Foundation), Fundacion Tierra (Earth Foundation), and visited a Bolivian newspaper, La Razon. She also visited personal contacts such as her former dance and Spanish teacher. Throughout her travels, Trisha also met with many Eisenhower fellows and their families.
The highlights of Ms. Lester’s trip were her meetings with individuals who were running small but effective grassroots organizations that were making a great impact in their communities. She explained, “In my role here at the North Carolina Center for Nonprofits, I observe firsthand how important the work of local nonprofits is on a day-in and day-out basis. Nonprofits are vital assets in their communities, and this is true for both urban and rural areas and, in most cases, it doesn’t matter what the country is. It was especially meaningful to observe this on an international basis. This kind of work is being done throughout the world, with some of the same challenges, and different considerations too, and yet there is a commonality between all of us.”

**Fellowship Outcomes and Impact**

Trisha Lester’s fellowship to Latin America broadened her perspective of the nonprofit sector and provided her with new knowledge. She explains, “The biggest outcome on a personal and professional level was the ability to sit back and look at the sector as a whole, since the more usual routine is to get bogged down by the daily minutia. The ability to do that – to really keep focused on the bigger picture – as a tremendous gift, and I’m grateful for the Eisenhower fellowship experience allowing me to do that.” Ms. Lester also said that the experience re-affirmed her belief in the importance of the nonprofit sector, and of the sector’s accomplishments and contributions to society as a whole.

However, Ms. Lester admits that aside from individual growth and learning, no specific outcomes or impacts have occurred as a direct result of her fellowship — yet. “The fellowship experience is an intense one, and I found that I really needed to let it sit for a while to fully reflect and understand what my next steps with it will be. While I’m not sure what specific issues and activities I’ll undertake in follow up to that experience, I know that I’ll build on it when the time is right.” However, Ms. Lester’s boss, the Executive Director of the North Carolina Center for Nonprofits, believes that impacts from Ms. Lester’s fellowship have started to occur.

While Ms. Lester believes she has benefited significantly from the EF experience overall, she has several points of constructive criticism and feedback about the fellowship.

**Fellowship Learning and Experiences**

Trisha Lester found out about the Eisenhower Fellowships from a former colleague who was the head of a leadership program in North Carolina. Despite the fact that she had already participated in other leadership programs—including programs at the Center for Creative Leadership (Greensboro location), and Leadership America North Carolina—she became interested in the opportunities that an Eisenhower fellowship could provide. She was particularly interested in traveling to Latin America because of the extraordinary demographic shift occurring in North Carolina and the Research Triangle area with its Latino and Hispanic population.

Ms. Audrey Alvarado, who has known Ms. Lester for approximately five years and wrote a letter of recommendation for Ms. Lester when she applied for the Eisenhower Fellowships, said: “[Ms. Lester] wanted to deepen her familiarity and understanding of various cultures so that her organization is better positioned to outreach and serve the needs and the concerns of a segment of
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6 Ms. Lester was interviewed for this case study approximately seven months after she returned from her EF travel experience.
the population that they, quite frankly, have not had a lot of experience [with].”

Ms. Lester applied to EF twice—she was a semi-finalist the first time in 2000 and was ultimately chosen in 2003.

In her final report to EF, Ms. Lester described some of the things that she learned during her time in Latin America. She wrote: “I saw example after example of how much the history of each of these countries has shaped the peoples’ national character, and it made me think more deeply about my own country’s history and attributes.” She wrote about Argentina’s economic crises; Bolivia’s cyclical history of ousted Presidents and overthrows; the violence associated with guerilla groups in Perú; and how each of these contexts has had some effect on the nonprofit sector. In Bolivia, for example, there exists a perception that NGOs are partisan arms of politicians, and that they exist merely to support specific ideologies.

**Sharing a Professional Tool**

According to Ms. Lester, the nonprofit sectors of the three countries she visited were at very different stages of development. Despite the differences, however, she found that there were also many common areas of concern. For example, she says that fundraising was the key issue in all three countries. Leadership, governance, ethics, accountability and transparency were also important concerns everywhere that she went. Before her trip, Ms. Lester sensed that this might be the case, so she brought with her copies of a nonprofit tool called “Standards for Excellence: A Self-Help Tool for Nonprofits Organizational Effectiveness,” which had just been translated into Spanish. The tool was originally developed by the Maryland Association of Nonprofit Organizations, and the North Carolina Center for Nonprofits has adapted it for North Carolina nonprofits. It uses basic organizational principles such as mission and program, governance, financial and legal issues, and fundraising, and provides 55 specific guidelines to help nonprofits strengthen their organization’s management, operations, and leadership.

Ms. Lester shared the Standards for Excellence: A Self-Help Tool with organizations as appropriate and found that their receptivity to the tool varied depending upon where the organization was in its own life cycle. She had an “extremely gratifying” experience when she met with the Executive Director of an environmental organization in Santa Cruz, who was having problems working with her board of directors. This contact was extremely interested in the Standards – particularly those concerning board conduct – and spent three hours discussing them with Ms. Lester. The very next day, the Executive Director presented the Standards to her board, and to her surprise, they responded favorably. Ms. Lester believes that sometimes if you introduce an idea or a tool from the “outside,” people will give it more credence than something they’re already familiar with.

**Potential Impacts**

“My fellowship also confirmed,” Ms. Lester states in her final report, “that in order to increase understanding around the world, we should tap the strengths of the nonprofit and civil society sector and use these organizations as critical players in international exchanges.” She believes that the U.S. would gain a lot in terms of international understanding if it would put some of the resources that are currently dedicated to political exchanges towards exchanges among nonprofit professionals.
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7 Ms. Alvarado is the Executive Director of the National Council of Nonprofit Associations (NCNA). Ms. Lester was a board member of NCNA when Ms. Alvarado started working there, and they have remained in contact since Ms. Lester left the board.
Ms. Lester also believes that the U.S. should export things other than “fast food, violent television and movies, and pubescent pop stars.” Instead, she would like to see exchanges of success stories and models of collaboration and organizing – “things that would prevent us from re-creating the wheel each time; things that have worked on the program side and on the organizational issues side,” she clarifies. She is interested in helping to facilitate this type of exchange among nonprofits, but simply has not had a chance to concentrate on this interest since her return from Latin America. “I know that it takes a lot of resources and time and energy, and it’s not the most immediate or pressing need on my plate right now, so it’s had to be put on the back burner.”

Ms. Lester says that she’s had a lot going on since she returned from Latin America, but that as personal situations resolve themselves, she hopes to think more about how she can utilize the lessons from her fellowship. “This was not one of those experiences where immediately, two months after, I was able to say, well, I can point to this being changed because of my Eisenhower fellowship. But, that’s not to say that that won’t happen in the future.” She’s especially interested in the issue of knowledge management and how it might be applied to nonprofits and the promotion of good practices, effective programs, and international exchanges.

The fellowship experience also did not change Ms. Lester’s career goals or notions of her own leadership. She – and others – already considered her to be a strong leader. Ms. Lester said, “I feel very comfortable with my role as a leader and how I translate that to my daily work, to the community I live in, and the causes I care about.” Ms. Alvarado said that she also thought of Ms. Lester as a strong leader before the fellowship. She described Ms. Lester’s leadership qualities: “I see strong leadership. The unique partnership she has with Jane Kendall, who is her Director, is one where it seems to be more of a co-leadership role that they’ve carved out for each other… [She also has a] good sense of people, [is] very sensitive and listens extremely well.”

Overall, in talking about the as-yet-unrealized outcomes and impacts of her EF experience, Ms. Lester says, “I think that every person who comes back from this kind of experience comes back with a very changed perspective. How quickly you can implement that in your own work and creating partnerships with other organizations or individuals remains to be determined. I’m still struggling with, ‘How will I do that? What form will it take?’ But that doesn’t mitigate the effect of the fellowship as a whole.”

Ms. Jane Kendall, Executive Director of the North Carolina Center for Nonprofits and Ms. Lester’s boss, believes that changes are apparent since Ms. Lester returned from her fellowship. She believes that Ms. Lester has become more confident in exerting particular skills since her EF travel – for example, her Spanish language skills and her cross-cultural knowledge and competence. Ms. Kendall says that she was very impressed when Ms. Lester led a conference session in Spanish following her fellowship. She also said that Ms. Lester has been more confident in stepping forward to help different groups collaborate around issues related to the changing demographics of the population in the Research Triangle area.

Ms. Kendall also described the experience of preparing for Ms. Lester’s six-week absence from the organization as a positive outcome in and of itself—she said that Ms. Lester was forced to delegate her responsibilities to other staff members, and that when she returned, she took only
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8 Ms. Kendall has known Ms. Lester for over 12 years, when Ms. Lester came to work at the North Carolina Center for Nonprofits (in 1992). They had corresponded via email for a year prior to that, when Ms. Kendall was founding the organization. Ms. Kendall’s husband was an Eisenhower fellow a few years ago, and she accompanied him for three weeks during his travel experience.
some of those responsibilities back. As a result, Ms. Lester has created more space and time for herself to take on new leadership responsibilities and to do more work with and in the community.

**New Connections**

One conduit by which impacts *may* occur in the future is through the new connections that Ms. Lester gained via EF. Concerning international contacts, Ms. Lester says that there are several individuals that she met with – both fellows and non-fellows – who she considers significant as potential sources of information. Particularly in Argentina, Ms. Lester says that several fellows were interested in creating a stronger relationship between themselves and the North Carolina fellows.

Concerning her relationships with the fellows in Research Triangle, Ms. Lester finds the group valuable. “I feel like I’ve got a pretty large professional network already… But the nice thing is, with the other North Carolina fellows, it’s given me entrée into sectors that I didn’t know about.” She describes the alumni group as “formal but loose” and was pleased to participate in the nominations process in 2004 and to have two of her nominations selected to become fellows. “I feel very close to the network in North Carolina. What I don’t have a concept of is the rest of the American fellows. They’re as distinct to me as someone in Thailand… In terms of knowledge transfer and knowledge management, there are great resources here in this country, but I don’t know how to tap them.”

About a month before her travel experience began, Ms. Lester attended the Eisenhower Fellowships’ 50th Anniversary Conference in Philadelphia. At first, she felt at a disadvantage attending the meeting before she had gone to Latin America. However, she now believes this was the best thing that could have happened. She says she got to meet some of the fellows with whom she would eventually visit, and she established groundwork with these individuals about her fellowship goals and interests. She also received advice from many alumni about how she could optimize her travel experience—for example, by not over-planning her daily schedule. Finally, she says that she was “amazed” at the caliber of professionals who attended the event. “I was very cognizant of the extraordinarily talented, intelligent, and extremely capable leaders I was surrounded by. It was humbling to be among that group.”
Profile at Time of EF Participation

Brigadier General Select Locker, 43, is a natural leader poised to enter Israeli Public Service after a distinguished military career. Presently as the chief administrative planner of one of the best managed and most respected Air Forces in the world, his responsibilities include making vital decisions on budget, procurement, infrastructure and human resource management. Brigadier General Select Locker has risen through the ranks with distinction to become a visionary leader at a critical time in Israel’s history. With the rapid and dramatic changes occurring in the Middle East, General Locker is constantly mindful of the need to institute novel managerial approaches and fresh perspectives. Being a son of a Holocaust survivor and tenth-generation Jerusalem family, he is deeply committed to the peaceful future of his country and region. He will use his Eisenhower fellowship to meet with innovative leaders from the private and public sectors to discuss the process of institutional change and learn new management strategies. He is interested in adopting ideas for his current work and future aspirations in public service.

Fellowship Experience

Mr. Locker’s principal goal for the eight-week-long fellowship was to broaden his understanding of managing change and institutional reform. To meet this goal, Mr. Locker met with executives from management consulting firms and large corporations including the Levinson Institute, Hay Group Innovation and Resource Center, Bain and Company, the Boston Management Consortium, and Toyota. He visited with officials and professionals in the public service field and met with a few military leaders.

Mr. Locker also visited key government and nonprofit leaders including members of the Federal Reserve Bank, the Pentagon, the United States Committee on Government Reform, the National Academy of Public Administration, and the Center for Quality Management. To gain better personal perspective, Mr. Locker spoke with individuals who were implementing change in their organizations, including the Secretary of State Colin Powell, Chief of Police Joseph Carter, Bill Branton – Chief of Police for the New York City Police Department, the San Diego Superintendent of Schools, and General Scowcroft. Mr. Locker also had the opportunity to attend The Change and Corporate Culture conference and meet with academics from Harvard Business School and the Hoover Institute at Stanford University.

Highlights of his trip included meeting the editor of the Government Executive Magazine, and visits at the Levinson Institute (an international training and consulting firm) and the Shoah Visual History Museum. Mr. Locker found his meetings with the South California PERF (Police
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Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

At the time of his nomination, Mr. Locker was a Colonel in the Planning Department, responsible for long-term and strategic planning. His entire career had been with the Israeli Air Force, and as a military leader and a citizen, Mr. Locker had witnessed incredible changes in his country. In designing his Eisenhower Fellowship itinerary, Mr. Locker wanted to focus on managing change and reform implementation. “It is a very dynamic world, and more specifically many changes need to be implemented in Israel as it is a young country – a country that needs to manage these changes.” While his aspiration was, and continues to be, to pursue a military career, Mr. Locker intends to enter the public service sector after his career with the armed forces. With this long-term goal in mind, Mr. Locker’s visits with top management consulting firms as well as a series of meetings with nonprofit and civic leaders provided a broad perspective on the topic of managing change. Thanks to these meetings, Mr. Locker returned to Israel equipped with a number of management tools and strategies, as well as a new understanding of and appreciation for American culture.

Leading with Confidence

As a military officer, General Locker always held leadership positions. When asked whether he viewed himself a leader, he offered: “Yes. As a squadron commander, the job description requires leadership. I have always been interested in positions of leadership rather than say…technical expertise. My motivation is always to be promoted to a position of command. Indeed, feedback that I receive from others makes it easier to evaluate myself as a leader. In a military setting it is easier to declare yourself a leader.”

Mr. Roni Brenner,9 a long-time friend and colleague of General Locker, confirmed the General’s continuing leadership role within the military structure, and added: “What is most important, though, is that people on the base really admire his leadership and I think that it is very important for a commander that people are willing to go after him.” When asked about General Locker’s leadership, a second informant, who wishes to remain anonymous, simply stated: “He’s got it – he is a person of integrity and strategic vision and this is not necessarily because he is a personal friend, but this is the opinion I have heard from many people. I am sure the fellowship had something to do with these opinions.”10

General Locker’s proclivity for leadership positions reaches beyond the command of squadrons. His eagerness to learn about managing change from various perspectives resulted in reforms and new models applied to the systems of the Israel Air Force. Since his return from the United States, Mr. Locker has been promoted to Brigadier General, moving him from a planning track to a commanding role with significantly more leadership responsibility. As he summarized, “My
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9 Mr. Brenner has known General Locker since 1979 when Mr. Brenner joined the Israeli Air Force. During the period immediately before the Eisenhower fellowship (1999–2001), Mr. Brenner reported to General Locker. Mr. Brenner left the Israeli Air Force in 2003 and has been working as the General Manager of the Israeli company that represents the Massachusetts-based company Raytheon specializing in defense. Mr. Brenner and General Locker are close friends and neighbors.

10 The two have been good friends since the early 1960s.
responsibilities have changed accordingly – I am now responsible for more lives and a larger budget.”

In addition to supplying new leadership ideas, the Eisenhower fellowship contributed to General Locker’s increased confidence – “I gained more confidence that I had chosen the right career path in terms of my leadership role.” General Locker is more self-assured when initiating and implementing change in his work – a quality he attributes directly to his fellowship experience. “I take greater risks implementing models and I think differently about people, their motivation and sharing my vision.”

**Applied Knowledge**

Many of the meetings that General Locker attended proved to be tremendously useful for collecting lessons learned, successes, and some failures. In addition, meetings with academics and consultants gave General Locker a broader perspective on organizational change. Specifically, he gained perspective on the impact of human factors and organizational behavior as driving forces within a changing environment. As he concluded: “The human factor was emphasized in all the meetings … Effective implementation of organizational changes begins with the recognition that unless people shift their behavior to support the change, no benefit is expected from the investment in the process.” Indeed, upon his return General Locker presented new knowledge to his staff. “I had a number of informal meetings with staff where I presented some new ideas. Sometimes I would say, I got this idea from X – we are going to adapt it and see how it works for us.” During the fellowship, General Locker said he “learned a lot about how to meet with others, how to share ideas and motivate individuals, how to make [my] subordinates committed.” Commitment to change, he learned, is a key element in a win-win situation.

When General Locker returned to the Israeli Air Force, he implemented a number of the models that he learned about during his EF meetings. Some particularly influential meetings included those with the County Chief Administrative Officer of San Diego County, Toyota, and the University of Washington.

General Locker was impressed with the large-scale reforms implemented by Walt Ekard, the County Chief Administrative Officer of San Diego County. In General Locker’s opinion, “the officer implemented huge reforms in the public sector – including performance-based salaries and pursuing market-based solutions such as allowing public service providers to compete with private companies. The entire undertaking reflected the idea of free market forces, entrepreneurship, innovation and creativity.”

Upon his return, General Locker began an initiative within the Israeli Air Force to privatize certain services, modeling his undertaking on the reforms he witnessed in San Diego. Mr. Brenner summarized General Locker’s accomplishments as the following: “When he came back, he had gained a new understanding of the principle of privatization. He had the opportunity to meet with the base commanders and actually implement some of these ideas, basically introducing privatization within the Israeli Air Force.” According to Mr. Brenner, introducing privatization into the military was no small feat considering the huge budgetary constraints and the organizational culture at the time. It was a culture, he said, which called for doing everything “in house.” As Mr. Brenner concluded: “It was a good time to implement successful change.”
Broadened Perspectives – Understanding America

One of the most notable outcomes of General Locker’s Eisenhower Fellowship experience was his new appreciation for, and understanding of, American culture. “I really feel like I learned and understood American culture. All of the meetings added to my appreciation of the concept of leadership and the role that American culture and lifestyle have in the development of this concept.” In his concluding report, General Locker stated that the “leading position of the United States in most fields can be credited to the American way of thinking. The matter-of-fact way of approaching situations and solving problems is the American way of thinking. Pragmatism and the concept of the free marketplace cheer the innovative and creative individual. The society respects those who take risks, and failures are respected as much as success stories.” Development of this understanding of “American pragmatism” has been valuable in General Locker’s career. “I have been able to use my insight not only within the military and Israel, but moreover in my connections with the United States. I have a better understanding of how to work with Americans, the terms [they use] and ideas they have – I can communicate better with individuals from the U.S.”

Mr. Brenner observed that one of the greatest impacts that the Eisenhower fellowship had on General Locker was it gave him a first-hand opportunity to “observe and understand the spirit of the American economy and to gain a unique understanding of the free market.” General Locker learned about the activities of organizations in the free market setting and gained insight into the “American system and way of thinking.” Mr. Brenner concluded: “Only upon seeing how companies of such scale [as General Motors] are managed can one understand what it means to be a director of such a huge business.”

While the focus of his fellowship was to gain insight into managing change, General Locker was well aware of the critical time in his country’s political situation. As a fellow, he made efforts to meet with individuals who would share their views of world politics and, in particular, the geopolitical situation in the Middle East. One such memorable meeting was with Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick, the former US Ambassador to the United Nations and an expert on world politics and international affairs. General Locker was particularly impressed with Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s enlightening insight on world affairs. As he concluded: “She has such a wide perspective on world affairs – even before September 11th we discussed issues of cultural conflict. Discussions of her political opinions and the way in which she analyzed events really opened my mind.”

Overall, General Locker says that all of his meetings were memorable. As Mr. Brenner declared: “The meetings with Colin Powell, Henry Kissinger, the CEO of General Motors and the New York City Chief of Police under Giuliani – being with such important individuals allows you to learn from them and has a lasting impact on the person.”

Knowledge Sharing and Networking

Upon his return to Israel, General Locker conducted a series of meetings with his Air Force commanders to speak in-depth about his experience. In addition, as mentioned above, he would include examples and models from the United States in his informal staff meetings. According to Mr. Brenner: “I am sure he made presentations, not necessarily formal, but certainly at the Air
Force Headquarters to commanders, the Chief of Staff. I am sure he presented to the right people. He took every opportunity to share the ideas he had learned.”

General Locker’s participation in the fellowship had some impacts in terms of his network. In Israel, he was invited to become a member of the Eisenhower committee, which nominates new fellows. He was also invited to speak about his fellowship experience with a University professor, who had heard about his nomination. Given his military position, General Locker had to decline these and other invitations to participate in various professional associations.

In terms of contacts that he made in the United States, General Locker has maintained some level of correspondence with a few individuals including Professor Michael Beer at Harvard Business School and some members of the Boston consulting groups. He concluded that if he were in a civilian position, he would most certainly make greater use of the Eisenhower network. He also mentioned that he really wanted to attend the Eisenhower 50 Year Anniversary celebration but unfortunately could not due to his work schedule. General Locker summarized that if he held a position as a civil servant or in the private sector, he would find great value in the expertise of the Eisenhower network – he was impressed with the caliber and diversity of individuals participating in the program. This sentiment was confirmed by his informant, who concluded, “It is difficult for someone in the military service. Maybe his network can be used later on if he chooses to go into politics. He is a good spokesperson for his own case – I think these contacts will become more fruitful when he is higher in the military ranks or if he pursues a career outside of the military.”

Looking Ahead

Whether General Locker meets his career goal of becoming a civil servant after his time in the military or not, he is certainly poised to make a distinguished contribution to Israeli society. The Eisenhower program was a momentous experience for him and it certainly had an impact on him professionally and personally. In the closing statement of his final report to the Fellowships, General Locker summarized his perspective on leadership as follows: “Leadership today reaches beyond the authoritative executive or politician. It demands vision and courage, and in this transformational time, often also a deep personal change in the mindset and behavior is needed. Leaders must become models of the transformation.” It is clear that the fellowship provided the impetus for change in both General Locker’s mindset and behavior.
Christine Massey  
Pennsylvania  
USA Fellow, 2001

Profile at Time of EF Participation

Conducting and applying the latest research in how children learn, Dr. Christine Massey and the Institute for Research in Cognitive Science at the University of Pennsylvania are on the cutting edge in preparing students at all levels for the “new economy.” The Institute, one of only 24 that are affiliated with the National Science Foundation, is achieving its goals of transforming public schools and is expected to become a national model. On her fellowship, Dr. Massey will study the frameworks that give rise to effective practices and reforms in the educational system. In particular, she will examine the partnerships that connect universities, government and community leaders to K-12 schools so that she can advise academic administrators on a global-minded curriculum in the Delaware Valley’s schools.

Fellowship Experience

Dr. Christine Massey participated in the Eisenhower Fellowship’s USA Program in the spring of 2001. The fellowship took her on a six-week journey to the Southern Hemisphere where she had the opportunity to meet with people from a wide range of sectors related to education and education reform in New Zealand and Australia.

During her fellowship experience, Dr. Massey participated in over 40 meetings. In an effort to gain a clear understanding of the educational system in New Zealand and Australia, she met with professors and researchers from a number of universities, including the Victoria University of Wellington, Canterbury University, Christchurch College of Education, the Victoria University of Technology, and Massey University. She explored the development of curricula and national educational standards in meetings with scholars from educational research institutions such as the New Zealand Centre for Educational Research and the Educational Assessment Research Unit of the University of Otago.

Dr. Massey was also able to gain some practical insight into New Zealand’s educational reform efforts through her meetings with the staff of New Zealand’s Ministry of Education, the New Zealand Educational Institute – the primary teachers’ union – and site-visits to a wide variety of schools (from preschools to high schools). Dr. Massey also explored the informal education sector, represented by educators working with well-established museums and zoos, as well as those working in newer areas of technology and media. Some of the institutions she visited include the Otago Museum, the Powerhouse Museum, Melbourne Museum, and the Melbourne Zoo. In addition, she visited LERNZ, an online education program for New Zealand students.
offering learning experiences outside the classroom; and the Australian Technology Park, a scientific research and development precinct.

While Dr. Massey’s exploration of the educational system, informal education sector, and education reform in Australia was rewarding, she gained the most insight from the time she spent looking at education reform in New Zealand. This portion of her fellowship left a more distinctive impact, particularly in regard to how the communities, schools, and educators were dealing with the repercussions of recent education reform efforts – collectively known as Tomorrow’s Schools.

**Fellowship Outcomes and Impact**

> “Among the many gifts – both anticipated and unexpected – of an Eisenhower Fellowship is the opportunity to break out of a customary perspective and to experience the juxtaposition of the familiar with the novel.” — Dr. Christine Massey, Fellowship Report, 2001

This observation from Dr. Massey’s fellowship report is perhaps the best summary of the enduring impact that the Eisenhower Fellowship has had on her professional career and personal life. Dr. Massey’s primary goal going into the fellowship was to examine the frameworks that give rise to effective practices and reforms that may have some practical bearing on the efforts to reform the public education system in the United States. The three fundamental objectives she identified to meet these goals included: (1) studying examples of long-term collaborative partnerships, particularly those between institutions of higher education and public education but also including government, business, family, and community partners; (2) studying working groups that exemplify good working processes in developing, implementing, and evaluating innovations; and (3) studying how other educational systems are meeting the challenge of educational equity and effectiveness while educating an increasingly diverse student population.

**Broadened Perspective**

Dr. Massey found her meetings with individuals who were dealing with the repercussions of New Zealand’s Tomorrow’s Schools reform effort to be enlightening. This was not only because of the reform efforts themselves but also by their “…having mastered the fine art of disagreeing vigorously with each other but nevertheless working together when needed.”

Zipora Roth, one of Dr. Massey’s longtime colleagues, remembers Dr. Massey describing the unwavering resolve of parents from some of the small rural communities in New Zealand to mobilize and become a permanent part of the reform process. As Dr. Massey shared photographs and recounted her fellowship experience, it was obvious to Ms. Roth that the ability of the business people, community residents, and educators to come together and form a partnership that actually led to a change left an indelible impression on Dr. Massey.

In Dr. Massey’s Fellowship Report, she noted that one of her most interesting experiences in New Zealand was a day trip to a teacher workshop on literacy. She spent the day in the company of one of the featured speakers from the workshop, as well as a woman who does site visits to schools for the Educational Review Office (ERO). (The ERO is a government department whose purpose is to evaluate and report publicly on the education and care of students in schools and early childhood programs.)
While acknowledging the critical and unique function of the ERO in New Zealand’s reform movement, Dr. Massey points out that the ERO had repeatedly been criticized for identifying problems and weaknesses in schools without offering solutions. Similar to the US school voucher system, the New Zealand reform effort was designed to inform parents about individual school performance and empower them to make informed decisions about where to send their children to school. However, this process encountered particular challenges when put into practice in low-income and rural communities that had either limited or no options for where children could receive their education.

Nonetheless, Dr. Massey elaborated on the benefit derived from this uncomfortable reform process that, in part, greatly influenced her appreciation for collaboration and partnerships. For example, in an effort to address the issues raised by a negative report about a school in a low-income, high minority community, a working group was formed consisting of representatives from the Ministry of Education, parents from the community, and professional educators. According to Dr. Massey, these three groups did not have a history of working together, did not like each other, and did not trust each other. Yet, despite these obstacles the group worked together for over three years in an attempt to improve the quality of education at the schools in their community. One parent, a self-employed craftsman, was forced to scale back his work by close to fifty percent, thereby giving up half of his yearly income, to devote the time and effort needed to see this collaborative effort succeed. This experience led Dr. Massey to develop a greater appreciation for “living with a partnership long enough to see them through the various stages of development to the point where they can be functional and constructive.”

**New Approach To Partnerships**

Dr. Massey’s role as the Director of Education Outreach for the Institute for Research and Cognitive Science includes building bridges connecting the cognitive science research community with education in traditional and nontraditional settings and increasing the quantity, depth, and quality of the traffic moving across those bridges. While this role has not changed, Dr. Massey’s approach to building those bridges has shifted significantly since her Eisenhower fellowship.

The fellowship provided Dr. Massey with a more invigorated approach to creating and maintaining partnerships. She explained that, following her Eisenhower fellowship experience, she reoriented how she spends her time, focusing more on cross-institutional collaboration and working with other groups at the University of Pennsylvania (Penn), for example the Center for Community Partnerships and a group called Access Science, which puts graduate and undergraduate students in schools to assist students in science and math. She now spends a lot more of her time meeting with people and working on projects that take her away from Penn and her usual local partners. She finds herself spending more time focusing on the “care and feeding” of an expanded pool of partners.

Ms. Roth noted that the attention that Dr. Massey spends on nurturing and developing partnerships has increased significantly. She stated that while Dr. Massey has always been well connected outside of Penn, the types of partnerships that she has, particularly with community based institutions and businesses, increased upon her return from the Eisenhower Fellowship. Cory Bowman, another long-time colleague of Dr. Massey, also noted that Dr. Massey’s approach to partnerships intensified following her participation in the Eisenhower Fellowship program. Although he felt that Dr. Massey might have developed this heightened focus on
partnerships on her own over time, he felt comfortable attributing the heightened focus on partnerships to Dr. Massey’s experiences in Australia and New Zealand.

**Leading the Field**

To some extent, the unique mission of the PENNlincs education group at IRCS established Dr. Massey as leader in her field prior to her participation in the Eisenhower fellowship. The Center was created through a grant from the National Science Foundation to explore the integration of cognitive research, education, and practice in a way that was not being broadly utilized when she initially began her work. Over time the National Science Foundation established other centers across the country to explore these issues and Dr. Massey found herself being invited to participate as an advisor or to conduct information-sharing visits with these other centers as they developed.

Dr. Massey felt that her broadened perspective and invigorated approach to creating and maintaining partnerships are things that would, in all likelihood, have evolved through other avenues as her career progressed. However, the fellowship’s continuous focus on leadership, through fellowship events in the United States as well as abroad, made her more self-aware and confident in establishing her own approach to leadership. Her increased leadership role is also apparent to her colleagues within the University and on the national stage as she takes a more defined leadership role in the establishment of new partnerships. One example is Penn’s participation in the Metro Math Center for Learning and Teaching, a multi-university learning center focused on mathematics teaching and learning in urban districts. The center is based at Rutgers University. Dr. Massey played an instrumental role in establishing this partnership, although Penn’s principal investigator is now based at the Graduate School of Education. Through this partnership, Dr. Massey’s department was able to build a stronger relationship with the School of Education and the center at Rutgers University.

**Final Thoughts**

“The Eisenhower fellowship serves as a catalyst, to move people to the next level of their career or profession.” This was Dr. Massey’s assessment of the fellowship when asked how it impacted her life and career progression. As alluded to in the opening quote, the Eisenhower Fellowship provided her with an opportunity to “step outside of the familiar” and examine issues, techniques, and approaches to leadership from a expanded point of view.
Maureen Mutasa  
Zimbabwe  
MNP, 2002

Profile at Time of EF Participation

A scientist by training, Ms. Mutasa, 43, is Director General of the Standards Association of Zimbabwe (SAZ), a chartered non-governmental agency that serves as the national standards body of Zimbabwe. As such, it develops and encourages the use of standards that contribute to the quality and competitiveness of products while safeguarding the health and safety of the communities that produce them. The work of the SAZ is pivotal in improving manufacturing in Zimbabwe, with the end results of increased exports, a stronger economic base, and continued societal development. Ms. Mutasa is recognized for her expertise, vision and leadership throughout Southern Africa and beyond – she has presented over 80 papers both domestically and abroad and is an active participant in numerous regional initiatives. She will use her fellowship experience to exchange ideas with her counterparts at the American National Standards Institute, American Society for Testing and Materials, and the FDA; and to meet with key players in the manufacturing sector as well as those involved in training, accreditation, and research.

Fellowship Experience

Ms. Mutasa’s meetings and conversations provided a comparison of standards systems between the United States and Zimbabwe. As the Director of the Standards Association of Zimbabwe, Ms. Mutasa’s main objectives for the fellowship were to visit and interact with senior executives of organizations related to the Standards Association of Zimbabwe and to share organizational experiences and visions in the face of globalization. Ms. Mutasa was hoping to strengthen her knowledge about standards development, product and system certification and testing in the United States and establish collaborative agreements with interested agencies. Furthermore, she also wanted to establish the link, if any, between the US voluntary standardization system and governmental regulatory bodies.

During her fellowship, Ms. Mutasa visited a variety of organizations including governmental agencies, standards development organizations, conformity assessment bodies, training organizations that specialize in standardization and quality matters, laboratories, and key executives from technology firms. Highlights of her trip include meetings at the Consumer Product Safety Commission, American Association of Laboratory Accreditation, Registrar Accreditation Board, and the American National Standards Institute. Ms. Mutasa visited a number of standards development organizations including the American Society for Quality, Underwriters Laboratories, and the American Society of Testing and Materials. She visited Compliance Certification Services, DNV Certification, and Certified Laboratories. Finally, Ms. Mutasa visited Sony and HBC Engineering.
A secondary goal for her experience was to interact with American society and culture. Ms. Mutasa enjoyed her visits at NASA, Kemaboard Walk and Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco, and a boat cruise along the Potomac. In addition, she dined with a number of executives and academics. Ms. Mutasa also had the opportunity to attend a discussion by Professor Jordan, an African American activist at Howard University.

**Fellowship Outcomes and Impact**

For Ms. Maureen Mutasa, the Eisenhower fellowship nomination could not have come at a better time in her professional career. While she had heard about the fellowship from some colleagues in the mid-1990s, she didn’t actually apply to the program until six years later, after meeting three Eisenhower fellows from Zimbabwe: Dr. Nkosana Moyo, Ms. Charity Jane Murandu and Mrs. Judith Mutamba. Ms. Mutasa accepted the fellowship in 2002 – within one year of becoming the Director General at the Standards Association of Zimbabwe (SAZ). She had been with the Association for 14 years and had made many accomplishments during this time.

According to Dr. Hywel Williams, the former Director General of the Association, Ms. Mutasa joined the SAZ as a micro-biologist and her potential was immediately evident.11 “She began working on developing and writing standards. She was ideal – intelligent, hard working – she had tremendous accomplishments. Then she moved to the certification of ISO 9000 and 14000 and again through her leadership she transformed the market of ISO certification in Zimbabwe.” At that point Dr. Williams retired, and within the year (there was an interim Director General in the meantime) the Board members of the Association nominated Ms. Mutasa as Director General. She was the first female to become the Director General of the Association, and she continues to hold the same position today, although the scope of her responsibilities has changed considerably.

Although she had achieved a position of leadership within her organization, Ms. Mutasa was interested in taking her career to the next level – the international level. As Mr. Emmanuel Jinda, the Chairman of the Association Board summarized, “Maureen’s participation in the Eisenhower Fellowship came at a very timely moment… It was very exciting as she wanted (and got) the opportunity to gain the greatest exposure possible and obtain a better appreciation from the global perspective.”12 The Eisenhower experience gave Ms. Mutasa a unique understanding of the demands of a global, multi-cultural world and truly propelled her, and the Standards Association of Zimbabwe, into the international realm. Since the fellowship she has been appointed to boards and panels of numerous international organizations and has traveled extensively to share her expertise. In addition, her experience as a fellow enhanced her confidence and contributed to a new level of professionalism. Ms. Mutasa returned from the United States equipped with new models, ideas for new financing structures, training and marketing tools, and numerous agreements with American standards associations – all of which have proven to be vital in the progress that the Association has made under Ms. Mutasa’s leadership.

---

11 Dr. Hywel Williams retired from his position as the Director General of the Standards Association of Zimbabwe in 2000. He continues to meet with Ms. Mutasa regularly as a mentor.
12 Mr. Emmanuel Jinda has been the Chair of the Board of the Association since 1996. He has known Ms. Mutasa on a professional level for nearly 10 years.
New Levels of International Leadership

When asked about the greatest personal impacts of the Eisenhower fellowship experience, Ms. Mutasa without hesitation listed confidence and professionalism. All of the meetings and activities she participated in were very valuable – some of the more memorable meetings included those with Dr. Henry Kissinger, Mr. Warren Christopher, and the President of the American National Standards Institute, Dr. Hurwitz. “Every aspect of the experience was a highlight and the opportunity to interact with such influential individuals as Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Christopher was exceptional. The exposure that I gained during the program significantly increased my confidence.” This increased confidence was observed both by her mentor, Dr. Williams, and the chair of the Association’s board, Mr. Jinda. Dr. Williams stated, “[The fellowship] has helped her to change a bit – meaning she has always been inclined to be outward looking, but she has become more aware and has a new confidence in her. Thanks to her contacts and the nomination overall, it has made her feel that even though this is a small country and a relatively small organization (although it is large for African standards), she has the confidence of feeling that she was among peers – which is very important.”

“She has always been an internationalist,” Mr. Jinda stated. “She is not contained in small ways, and her enthusiasm for these international linkages has had tremendous benefits.” Indeed the linkages that Ms. Mutasa established not only contributed to her increased confidence and professionalism, but gave her a unique understanding of globalization.

Both of Ms. Mutasa’s informants agreed with Ms. Mutasa that the Fellowship played a major role in her being invited to join numerous international organizations. “She has used her reservoir of contacts to be nominated and involved in various international and regional organizations,” stated Mr. Jinda. Ms. Mutasa’s involvement in international organizations includes chairing the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Policy Committee for Developing Countries (as the first woman of color), being one of five members for the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC) Clean Development Mechanism Accreditation Panel, and being the only non-South African member of the South African National Accreditation System. As Ms. Mutasa humbly stated, “I would like to think that the fellowship changed others’ perceptions of me as a leader. All of these nominations came after the Eisenhower experience.”

During the fellowship, Ms. Mutasa met with Dr. Hurwitz, the President of the American National Standards Institute. She discussed Africa’s concerns regarding international standardization activities. Following their conversation, she was happy to learn that Dr. Hurwitz had presented the ideas that they had discussed at the ISO General Council meeting in May of 2002. Ms. Mutasa felt that she had had the unique opportunity to contribute to international discussions around standardization policies and practices.

Since the fellowship, Ms. Mutasa has made an international name for herself and the SAZ. In a recent meeting between Mr. Jinda and the Minister of Industry and International Trade, “the Minister indicated that while Zimbabwe is viewed poorly in the international community due to the recent political situation, everyone speaks of the Standards Association of Zimbabwe glowingly, which was flabbergasting for the Minister to hear.” Mr. Jinda concluded, “This is in part due to the tremendous work that Maureen does.” This opinion was shared by Dr. Williams, who said, “She really grasped the concept of globalization. Here is one area where we can
reverse the political isolation where Zimbabwe is heading these days. It is good to see her increased confidence even given [Zimbabwe’s] political climate.”

“I have always wanted to play a leadership role in the field of standardization, but not only locally – also regionally and internationally. Internationally at the highest level.” This was Ms. Mutasa’s professional goal prior to her participation in the Eisenhower fellowship program, and it is fair to conclude that she has achieved this goal as she continues working towards even greater international cooperation. In her own words, “The leadership has always been there, but the Eisenhower experience raised it to the international level.” This sentiment was echoed by Mr. Jinda, “The program really helped her to assert herself locally, regionally and internationally.”

**Disseminating Information**

Upon her return from the United States, Ms. Mutasa shared her new knowledge in several ways. Aside from making a personal presentation to Mr. Jinda, the Chairman of the Board, she also made presentations and circulated written memos to the Board at large, the management team at the Association, and her peers. As a member of the Inner Wheel Club – a club of Rotary members’ wives (Ms. Mutasa’s husband is a Rotarian and is the President of the Harare West Rotary Club) – she made numerous presentations throughout Harare about her experience as an Eisenhower fellow. In addition, she submitted an article, which was included in the Association’s bulletin which is circulated internationally. “Because of all of her contacts, she is really sought out internationally – she really has the opportunity to pass on what she learned and have a two-way conversation with a broader audience,” Mr. Williams summarized.

**Tools of the Trade**

Ms. Mutasa returned to Zimbabwe with a tremendous amount of new models, ideas, signed agreements of understanding and countless other assets that she utilizes in her work today. She is continually looking to adapt the models that she saw in the United States to fit the needs of Zimbabwe. She is currently working to replicate financing structures that she explored while visiting DNV Certification (she has actually initiated the use of sub-contracted auditors as in the United States).

Mr. Jinda highlighted a number of Ms. Mutasa’s undertakings. “Her main mission was to learn about the administration and coordination of voluntary standardization processes and how they operate. In a third world country such as Zimbabwe, we wish to have the same level of consumer awareness as elsewhere, but unfortunately that is not the case. Maureen was keen to see if there was a way to cooperate the voluntary adoption of standards with authorities and how to link up with regulatory bodies. She has negotiated MOUs with local authorities to get them to adopt a view of ensuring quality. The MOUs that she has established with authorities to encourage the use of standards are based on her observations of models from the United States.” Influenced by the system of accountability in the United States, Ms. Mutasa has also become an avid advocate for the development and strengthening of consumer rights courts.

In addition, Ms. Mutasa brought back a number of useful publications and formal agreements (MOUs) with American standards associations including the American Society for Testing Materials and QSU Publishing. In effect, what her efforts have done, as Mr. Jinda summarized, was “opened Zimbabwe to the world.” Both he and Ms. Mutasa noted that prior to her Eisenhower Fellowship, Zimbabwe relied solely on standards from Great Britain and South Africa. The wealth of resources that Ms. Mutasa brought back has “been vital to SAZ and has been used extensively,” according to former Director General Williams, and has truly broadened
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the scope and capabilities of the Standards Association of Zimbabwe. These efforts have had
tremendous impacts overall and have been a great asset for Zimbabwean companies exporting to
the United States.

**Networks and Civic Engagement**

An indisputable outcome of Ms. Mutasa’s experience has been the extensive list of contacts –
both professional and social – that she has gathered. As Mr. Jinda concluded, “Maureen has an
exhaustive list of contacts that she continues to rely on.”

While she admits that she has failed to maintain her social contacts as diligently as her
professional ones, she is looking to rekindle her social contacts once again. She has been recently
nominated as the Honorary President of the Inner Wheel Club and, as such, she intends to use her
Eisenhower connections to improve the civic support of projects targeting needy populations in
her community. On a personal level, her goal is to contribute more to the people in her rural
community who are in need.

The Eisenhower fellowship gave Ms. Mutasa the opportunity to interact with interesting
individuals from numerous countries representing diverse cultures. She recalls her meetings with
the other fellows as a tremendous bonding experience. “I had great exposure to true cultural
diversity and all of my experiences helped me realize that communication and networking are
critical in the globalized world.” Ms. Mutasa is active with the Eisenhower Alumni Association
and is currently in the process of selecting nominees for the upcoming year.
Profile at Time of EF Participation

A passionate advocate for Philadelphia’s performing arts community, Aaron Posner has emerged as one of the most dynamic young arts leaders in the region. Since co-founding the Arden Theatre Company in 1988, Mr. Posner has succeeded in establishing the Arden as one of the preeminent theatres in the Philadelphia area through his leadership as Artistic Director and now Resident Director. He is currently responsible for artistic oversight, direction, fund-raising, teaching and long-term planning. On his Eisenhower fellowship to Central and Eastern Europe, he will meet with government officials, academics and experts in arts and culture, as well as community and business leaders to better understand the relationship between the arts and community development.

Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

Floating peacefully down an Eastern European river might not seem like the most obvious time for a shift in perspective, but for Aaron Posner, a quiet late-night conversation during his Eisenhower Fellowship experience marked just such a moment. “We were on the deck of a boat, going down the Croatian coast, which is just gorgeous,” he remembers. A young bystander overheard him speaking in English and approached him. “She started asking me about America – the land of opportunity, where the streets are paved with gold, [although] obviously not in those terms,” says Mr. Posner. “It was the first time I’d ever actually heard it in quite that way... It was stunning.”

While this conversation gave him “a stronger appreciation than I’d ever had” for the opportunities available in the United States, it contrasted sharply with a lecture Mr. Posner received later in the trip, from a man with strong opinions about American policies. Yet both conversations typified his journey, which was often marked by such small, personal interactions. They provided a rich texture for his exploration of differences between U.S. and Eastern European styles of theatre. “The actual, factual information about the differences, I had before I went [on the fellowship],” he says, citing factors such as the influence of communism and the history of government funding for the arts. “[But] to see what that meant to the artists...was fascinating.”
Fellowship Outcomes and Impacts

A Critical Bridge: Blending Artistic Vision and Philanthropic Savvy

If there is a single word to describe Aaron Posner’s Eisenhower fellowship experience, it might be *synthesis*. As a playwright and director, he says that his journey to Eastern Europe was the opportunity of a lifetime, affording him the chance to see more than sixty performances during a whirlwind tour of ten countries. His fellowship blended new experiences with longtime interests, allowing him to gain a broader understanding of his field and to incorporate that understanding into his work.

“Aaron has a fundamental understanding, appreciation and passion for traditional, classic American theatre,” says Nick Stuccio, the producing director of the Philadelphia Live Arts Festival (previously the Philadelphia Fringe Festival) and a longtime colleague. But, says Mr. Stuccio, Mr. Posner also wanted to understand “the other side” – which he characterizes as experimental, avant-garde, non-American performance art. Traveling to a region with a different political and cultural history, and visiting places where he did not speak the language either literally or figuratively, was a way to do that. “I think it’s incredible for a person...to have that kind of desire,” says Mr. Stuccio. “He sought out the opportunity, got it, and did it.”

During his fellowship, Mr. Posner visited with artists and arts professionals from a wide range of backgrounds. A single day’s itinerary in Brno, Czech Republic included meetings with directors of ballet, puppetry, and experimental theatre companies, as well as the mayor. Having embarked on the fellowship with a relatively unstructured itinerary, Mr. Posner seized opportunities to build new connections as his journey progressed, altering his schedule to incorporate emerging possibilities.

His initial meetings tended to be strictly informational, and his subsequent advice to other Eisenhower Fellows has been to get beyond those introductory meetings. While the scheduled meetings are a valuable source of information, he says, it is the informal, after-hours interactions that offer the most fruitful prospects for learning. “[I met with] people who said, ‘Hey, why don’t you come see this show tonight, and we’ll have a drink afterward.’ And that’s when you got the real texture of the country.”

A Widening World-View

Getting the texture of the country was an integral part of Mr. Posner’s fellowship experience, and he carefully observed the interplay between Eastern European society and its art. In particular, the long history of government-supported reparatory theatre in the region contrasted sharply with American-style theatre. In addition, companies that hosted him often had salaried actors and musicians on staff, providing a sharp contrast to part-time or contract players in the United States. However, the companies were constrained by the funding restrictions imposed by their government sponsors, and in some cases, due to government ownership of theatre companies, artistic directors could be hired and fired by local politicians.
Such direct control of art by government agencies is nearly unheard of in the United States, notes Mr. Posner – but then, so is Europe’s history and depth of community support for the arts. “The National Theatre in Prague was founded as a way of keeping the Czech language alive [during] German rule,” Mr. Posner wrote, in a report produced upon his return from the fellowship.

“German was the language of culture and of State, and it was felt that only by creating a Czech-speaking theatre could the Czechs regain and maintain a sense of themselves as an independent people and nation. Can you imagine that kind of importance being placed on the role of the theatre in the States?”

Attending performances added another layer to his perspective. He contrasted European theatrical techniques with those in the U.S., commenting on the “starker, more aggressive theatricality” as well as the use of live music and particular kinds of lighting.

As his professional understanding of theatrical possibilities was growing, Mr. Posner was also absorbing a more nuanced, international view of the United States. The timing of his 2001 fellowship was such that he returned to the U.S. mere weeks before the September 11th terrorist attacks. “While I was as stunned by September 11th as much as any of my friends were...the fact that the world doesn’t see us as we see ourselves, was I think less of a surprise to me,” he says thoughtfully.

**Applying Lessons from the Fellowship**

Though it has been barely three years since his trip, the myriad experiences of Mr. Posner’s fellowship have already begun to be reflected in his work, according to Susan Sherman, President and CEO of the Independence Foundation in Philadelphia and an early mentor and supporter of Mr. Posner. “Everything he’s been doing since he returned has a piece of the fellowship involved in it,” she says. “The thing about him that makes him unique is that he takes where he’s been and uses it in some way, to say something new.” One example is his approach to text. The legacy of political censorship in Eastern European theatre created a tradition in which the written word is more malleable than in the U.S., says Mr. Posner. “[Making changes to the text of a play was] certainly not something that was alien to me. But [my] flexibility or willingness to be more manipulative and more complex with the text...has grown,” since the fellowship. The European emphasis on multilayered text, where the playwright’s words carry meaning on several levels at once and directors feel free to rearrange language to suit their own ambitions, has encouraged him to assume a similar freedom, especially when directing works by Shakespeare.

The influence of the fellowship has surfaced in Mr. Posner’s art in other subtle ways, most notably in a piece he directed for last year’s Philadelphia Fringe Festival. “[Aaron] went outside the box a little in his directorial style,” says Mr. Stuccio. “I’m sure that having seen the theatre he saw on his journey in Eastern Europe affected some of his choices.” Mr. Posner concurs: “I came back resolved to make my work more international.”

Mr. Posner remains intent on continuing the cultural interchange begun during the fellowship, even when persistence is required. In Washington, D.C. next year, he will stage a play that he found during his Eisenhower Fellowship. Describing it as “the American premiere of a Hungarian play about the French Revolution,” he adds that he has already incorporated the play into a course he teaches at Philadelphia’s University of the Arts. His other work shows similar signs of a global perspective. For an upcoming research project, he plans to travel to England, Scotland, and possibly Hungary. “I don’t think I would have thought of the international component [of the trip]” without having had the fellowship experience, he says.
The strongest evidence of the fellowship’s impact on Mr. Posner may be the increasing density of his network of fellowship contacts. The ripple effects of these relationships continue to spread. “He’s in great contact, and now I am too, with some of the other fellowship recipients,” Mr. Stuccio says. Two of these fellows have since joined Mr. Posner as board members of Mr. Stuccio’s organization. “I keep drafting my fellow fellows,” Mr. Posner says. “They’re such an interesting group of people.” The wealth of expertise among the Eisenhower Fellowships alumni is a valuable source of support for individual fellows, both personally and professionally, according to Mr. Posner. “I’m genuinely interested [in simply maintaining relationships], but...I [also] have a more powerful motivation,” he says, citing the ability of fellows to make contributions of time, money or expertise to Philadelphia arts organizations.

A Fellow’s Leadership: Connecting and Communicating

An ability to assimilate new and sometimes challenging information becomes evident when speaking with Mr. Posner, who plays many connecting roles within his community. The very variety of work he does – as a writer, director, philanthropic consultant, actor, teacher, board member, activist, advisor and mentor – is a testament to the multifaceted nature of his leadership. “If there’s such a thing as a typical fellow, I’m not one,” he admits. Indeed, rather than having a single, full-time job, Mr. Posner’s passion for art and exploration is itself the centrifugal force in his life.

“He’s an incredibly talented individual,” says Ms. Sherman. During his fellowship, she received detailed email travelogues from Mr. Posner, which he sent to a long list of friends and supporters. “It was a fascinating, ongoing, lengthy document,” recalls Ms. Sherman. Half journal, half travelogue, a typical email would segue from a discussion of theatre to a description of what it was like to take a sea bath in Budapest. The thread that held it all together, she says, was a degree of humor that was “quite wonderful.” The descriptions were so vivid that “some of us felt like we were on the fellowship with him,” Ms. Sherman says with a laugh. During that time period, she adds, when she gathered with colleagues, “We would be chuckling about Aaron’s most recent experience.”

Mr. Posner’s ability to maintain a dual perspective is a hallmark of his leadership, according to his colleagues. Balancing his artistic work with a vision for the continued development of performing arts in the city, he is committed to fostering Philadelphia’s thriving arts scene. By serving as a philanthropic advisor to both foundations and individual donors, he provides an important conduit for funding to an array of organizations. “He’s out there advocating...for dozens of individual artists and companies,” says Mr. Stuccio, who describes Mr. Posner’s work in connecting artists with resources as “critical.”

Less obvious but perhaps even more important are his behind-the-scenes efforts to stay in touch with people at all levels of professional expertise and status. “He has a very thick Rolodex...[and] he’s always on the phone with the grassroots constituency,” says Mr. Stuccio. At the same time, he remains engaged with the broader world, including meeting with a group of international Eisenhower fellows visiting the U.S. in the spring of 2004.

“I was just thrilled,” Mr. Posner says, when EF called and asked him to meet with a subset of fellows working in the arts. Indeed, he is eager to be called upon again: “I would have been happy to do two or three meetings,” he says, or to work more closely with EF in helping to arrange
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meetings and itineraries for the visitors. One such interaction has already occurred: “I hosted a [current Eisenhower] fellow the other day,” says Mr. Stuccio.

Where to from Here?

What will happen next? Colleagues see a host of possibilities for Mr. Posner, many of which have been sparked by connections made in the past few years. “Before the fellowship, he had an inkling – an interest and a curiosity” of what interested him, says Mr. Stuccio. “And through the fellowship, he developed the language and experience base to...match.”

“He’s a builder,” Ms. Sherman agrees. “Other people are settlers, but Aaron moves on to build again.” She says his restless energy manifests itself through his choice of work, which now includes teaching a college course, directing nearly a half-dozen plays each year, serving as a board member for local arts organizations, and mentoring other nonprofits both formally and informally. And a new venture is percolating. “He’s on another sort of mission now,” says Mr. Stuccio, “to bring a sort of performance think-tank R&D program to [Philadelphia].”

Mr. Posner himself has some specific plans: “I’m traveling to Ireland this summer and India next year,” he says, “and I plan to look up Eisenhower Fellows to see if I can make contact.” Then, there are his ties to Eastern Europe, to which he would like to return. “I’ve tried to stay aware of what’s going on,” he says, both through personal correspondence and email updates on the Hungarian theatrical community. At the same time, “I live in the same pull I’ve always lived in,” he says, referring to the creative tension of his assorted professional roles. “Maybe what’s changed...is that if and when I want to, I will have some other resources and some other perspectives” to assist him in making a career transition.

Ms. Sherman urges caution in trying to predict the future. A fellowship can provide “absolutely brilliant thinking time,” she says. “[But] do you see the results of that immediately? Never.” At the Independence Foundation, she says, “As we [have] talked to artists who have had fellowships, they’ll say, ‘You know, I started thinking about [this new project] when I was [doing] X, Y, and Z,’” which may have no linear or even discernable connection, she points out.

“There are definitely paths in the future, that are in my mind as provocative possibilities, that would not be there if it wasn’t for the fellowship,” Mr. Posner says. What form those possibilities will take is a tantalizingly open question, which he seems happy to leave that way for now. “I’m not sure he wants to be pinned down,” Ms. Sherman says. Mr. Stuccio agrees: “He’s on a journey, and he’s...in the midst of it still.”
Virada Somswasdi  
Thailand  
MNP, 1992

Profile at Time of EF Participation

Initially drawn towards diplomacy, Ms. Somswasdi studied law and became the first Thai student at Cornell Law School. Returning to Thailand in 1973, she joined the democratic movement. During the trial period of democracy of the mid-1970s, she founded the first women’s studies program in the country, where she has combined academic research with commitment towards working for human rights and rural development. She will use her fellowship to expand a network of information about women’s development in third world countries, and to forge linkages with equal rights and minority women’s organizations in the United States.

Fellowship Experience

Ms. Somswasdi viewed the Eisenhower fellowship as an opportunity to expand her network of organizations and individuals working in the field of women’s rights and development. She visited over 50 programs in 15 states. Her itinerary focused on academic institutions and research centers in efforts to collect materials and information that would support her Women’s Studies Center at Chiang Mai University. She visited women’s studies programs and research centers in 13 universities including the University of Michigan, Tulane University, University of California at Berkley, University of New Orleans, the State University of New York, Tufts, Cornell, and Bennington College in Vermont. Some of the more notable visits – at the University of Illinois, University of Washington in Seattle, and the University of Wisconsin – resulted in exchange programs and lasting professional relationships.

In order to gain a broader perspective on international development issues and advocacy, Ms. Somswasdi visited one environmental institution (UNOCAL Foundation), two international organizations (United Nations Development Fund for Women and the World Bank), a funding agency (Oxfam America), and three nonprofit organizations focusing on women’s issues and human rights (Equal Rights Advocates, World Watch Institute and International Institute). She visited two Native American Indian centers – the Pueblo Indian Reservation and the Iroquois Indian Museum. Ms. Somswasdi also took time to visit with friends and old professional contacts.

Some highlights of Ms. Somswasdi’s trip included her meetings at the University of Washington in Seattle, University of Wisconsin, the World Watch Institute, and an appointment with the Director of the Women in International Development Center at the University of Illinois.
Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

The Eisenhower fellowship led to numerous advancements in Ms. Virada Somswasdi’s work in the field of women’s studies. The collection of materials, information, ideas on models and types of women’s studies programs informed and inspired the creation of a graduate level Women’s Studies program at Chiang Mai University. Meetings with some of the most influential women’s studies programs in the United States also helped Ms. Somswasdi develop a broader perspective on the field of women’s rights. Her conversations reinforced her belief in the importance of her work, but more importantly amplified her dedication to collaborate with women’s rights activists across continents and within regions. In addition, the fellowship empowered and re-energized Ms. Somswasdi to push the women’s rights agenda even further. Her international network was strengthened and in the process Ms. Somswasdi gained numerous new friends – she still exchanges Christmas cards with fellows from her year!

Empowerment and Confidence Building

At the time of her nomination, Ms. Somswasdi had been working on women’s issues for well over two decades. She had managed to set up a Women’s Studies program at Chiang Mai University in 1986, and only two years prior to her nomination to the Eisenhower fellowship, this was the department endorsed by the Ministry of University Affairs as the first official Women’s Studies department in Thailand. She had recently secured funding for the building of a Women’s Studies Center. Her accomplishments were the result of tireless advocacy efforts in a relatively indifferent environment. As she recalls, the university administration considered women’s studies a “fashion” and not worth the financial investment. In effect, Ms. Somswasdi found herself in a perpetual “uphill struggle.”

The nomination for the Eisenhower fellowship came at a very opportune point in her career. “At the time of the nomination I was so exhausted, feeling down,” she recalls, “having to fight against the university administration, not to mention constant gender bias in my daily life. The fact that such a prestigious organization wanted to attach their name to mine was a sign that what I was doing was important – it was good to know that the effort was being noticed.” The nomination not only encouraged Ms. Somswasdi, but it breathed new life into her activist efforts. “[The year] 1992 was a great leap forward – the fellowship refreshed me, empowered me, and encouraged me to keep going.”

The fellowship allowed Ms. Somswasdi to regain confidence. “When I returned I was ready to take more risks – to show the administration that Women’s Studies was not just a fashion, but that it is a long term mission and that it is significant.” The nomination to the fellowship did not, however, increase Chiang Mai University’s recognition of her efforts. Nor did it particularly contribute to increased leverage among funding agencies. As she points out, the fellowship is virtually unknown in Thailand – public relations are slim, so no one knew of her nomination. Admittedly, she had no knowledge about the fellowship at the time of her nomination. “I didn’t even know that I was being considered – I have visitors all the time, so when the American Counsel brought some individuals [to the Center] for a conversation it was not unusual. I was surprised when the US Consulate called to request that I consider the nomination… Otherwise I

13 Capital development funding was provided by the Norwegian Association of Woman Jurists (NAWJ).
don’t think anyone noticed my nomination for the Eisenhower Fellowship until my appointment for Woman of the Year in 2002.”

**A Few Words on Leadership**

When asked if she considered herself a leader prior to her fellowship, Ms. Somswasdi said:

“No – not until 2002 when I received the Woman of the Year award. Up to that point, and even today, it is hard to think of myself as a leader. If I see a void that I think needs to be addressed I will fill it. If someone else picks it up and runs with it, that’s great – I can move on to something else... My partner brands me as having an inclination for leadership. I only know what is supposed to get done – this is not a leadership inclination.”

While Ms. Somswasdi may not consider herself a leader, her university colleague and long-time friend Dr. Benchapan Shinawatra Ekasingh has a different opinion. “I believe that Virada is a leader. She knows so many individuals and has influenced so many people. She can ask others to do things and with all of the projects she has initiated she has a very good image.” This belief is echoed by another colleague of nearly 30 years, Dr. Gary Suwannarat. “Virada is undoubtedly viewed as a leader. Virtually any issue that has arisen in the past decades relating to women’s rights, she has had something important to contribute. She has a broad view on the implication of socio-political and economic arrangements and their impact on women. She has a strong voice on the impact of laws and customs prejudice again women, children and minorities.”

Over the past three decades, Ms. Somswasdi has been working to improve the status of Thai women through her advocacy, education efforts, and lobbying; she also worked on the re-writing of the 1997 Thai constitution to incorporate legally binding amendments to protect women’s civil liberties. According to Dr. Suwannarat: “Virada was concerned with the status of women as it pertains to family tradition and Thai law. These issues have been treated in the re-writing of the Thai constitution – something she worked on very hard.”

While the fellowship may not have contributed to Ms. Somswasdi’s self-perception as a leader, it did provide a re-fueling of self-confidence and encouragement to continue with her women’s rights agenda. “The fellowship was a confirmation of the need for the hard fight. The meetings that I had confirmed that the field of women’s issues is similar in all parts of the world – even in America it is an uphill battle and we have to push with all of our efforts – we cannot do it on a part-time basis…otherwise you will sleep and be pushed back.”

When asked about her career plans and goals before and after the fellowship, Ms. Somswasdi concluded: “I am not so organized to have a long-term plan. I do not have specific goals or ambitions. Goals change quickly – if I see something that makes me say ‘this is not right’, if

---

14 The Prime Minister’s Award of the “Woman of the Year,” nominated by a good number of women’s organizations represented by the Gender and Development Research Institute, was presented to Ms. Somswasdi in recognition of her 30-year struggle for women’s rights.

15 Dr. Benchapan Shinawatra Ekasingh is an Associate Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics, the Faculty of Agriculture at Chiang Mai University. She has known Virada Somswasdi for over 20 years as a friend.

16 Dr. Gary Suwannarat has known Ms. Somswasdi almost 30 years since Ms. Somswasdi started working at Chiang Mai University. Dr. Suwannarat is an Adjunct Professor at the Department of Government and Research Center for Sustainable Development at Chiang Mai University. She is also an independent consultant on social policy issues, focusing principally on women, children, health and education.
there is a violation of human dignity or human rights, that is what I must fight for – that becomes the immediate goal.” While the overarching goal of women’s equality has remained constant, the Eisenhower fellowship contributed to the strengthening of Ms. Somswasdi’s conviction.

**Changing Perspectives**

Upon receiving the nomination and researching the fellowship, Ms. Somswasdi had a few reservations about accepting the honor, including what she perceived to be a Republican affiliation of the fellowship. “I was hesitant because the Republican Party has an image of the political group whose agenda and political platform revolve around wealth and economic benefits – not the underprivileged, disadvantaged and minorities – groups that I work with.” Ultimately, the flexibility to design her own program convinced her to accept the nomination. In retrospect, the “Republican linkage proved to be beneficial and not problematic.”

The fellowship experience contributed directly to Ms. Somswasdi’s newfound ability to work with diverse organizations and persons. As she admits, thanks to the fellowship experience she is able to work with people and organizations with agendas that are different than hers. “This is not to say that I agree with them – I will keep my ideology clear and we can have a regular dialogue about the issue, as long as they understand that I am not going to bend.” Ms. Somswasdi admits that before the fellowship she declined invitations if she felt that there would be conflicting opinions at the table. Being able to present and defend her agenda in a diverse setting has contributed to Ms. Somswasdi’s influence in Thailand and the region at large.

**Translating Materials into Practice**

The greatest and the most valued aspect of the fellowship, according to Ms. Somswasdi, was the ability to meet with various women’s studies department chairs and academics. In a time before the worldwide web, Ms. Somswasdi was able to collect precious materials, syllabi, course outlines, and supporting documents. The outcome of her data collection was the creation of the graduate Women’s Studies program at Chiang Mai University. Dr. Suwannarat summarized: “The principal thing that came out of the fellowship was the establishment of the Women’s Studies program.”

Ms. Somswasdi recalls, “The course syllabi and information about program structures that I gathered led me to choose to create a graduate women’s studies program.” The program that Ms. Somswasdi created is a “mix and match” of programs that she observed in the United States, rather than the adaptation of a specific model. “When I came back to Thailand and I began designing the program based on the materials that I had gathered, I realized that most of the American Women’s Studies programs focus heavily on the humanities. I see the cross-cutting nature of women’s studies, so I took different syllabi and I created a comprehensive program categorized into four areas.” The four areas include the Humanities, Political Science and Law, Anthropology and Economics, and Health. With strong support from junior colleagues whose concentration and new information on the women’s studies programs from universities in the United States and the United Kingdom, the Women’s Studies M.A. program was launched in 2000 and is the first of its kind in Thailand.

In addition, Ms. Somswasdi has initiated numerous programs and projects including the development of a paralegal network at the grassroots level. Both Dr. Suwannarat and Dr. Ekasingh mentioned this accomplishment. In addition, Dr. Suwannarat mentioned that Ms. Somswasdi had been courted by numerous organizations in Bangkok including the Human Rights Commission, and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), but her
allegiance to Chiang Mai University and the populations she serves prevented her from accepting the positions.

**Working Networks**

A number of Ms. Somswasdi’s meetings during the fellowship translated into long-term professional relationships and exchange programs. Fourteen years after her fellowship, the Women’s Studies Center at Chiang Mai University welcomes professors and students from the University of Washington at Seattle on a regular basis. The two women’s studies programs maintain an on-going exchange of faculty and staff to conduct seminars and special interest lectures. Ms. Somswasdi and Dr. Marjorie A. Muecke, Professor of Nursing and Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at the University of Washington, maintain regular email contact and continue to supplement one another’s work.

Dr. Ekasingh confirms this increase in Ms. Somswasdi’s contacts. “I believe that the fellowship gave Virada a better link to professors, donors and other organizations that do work in her area of expertise. I am sure that the international connections she gained were very helpful to her career.”

Ms. Somswasdi’s meeting with Dr. Kathleen Cloud at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana opened the door for her networking with the Association of Women in Development, a formal professional association that she currently belongs to. 17 Ms. Somswasdi maintains that she would not be a member of the association had it not been for her meeting with Dr. Cloud.

Today, Ms. Somswasdi continues to work at both the local and international level, pursuing her commitment to inter-regional cooperation. She often works with another Eisenhower Fellow – Salma Kahn from Bangladesh. The two met at regional and international conferences and quickly established that they were both Eisenhower fellows. Their immediate connection has proven to be very helpful professionally. As Ms. Somswasdi stated, “Salma and I meet occasionally at UN meetings and we are sort of partners/movers of the same issues. Her friendship has been very helpful for me.” Often Ms. Somswasdi represents women’s groups and NGOs at large regional development meetings, while Ms. Khan works within the UN structure or as a representative of the Bangladeshi government. This allows Ms. Somswasdi to gain insight into women’s rights issues from a different perspective. She says, “there are certain issues that when I need to lobby for them, I go to Salma.”

**Other Memorable Moments**

Ms. Somswasdi mentioned two additional meetings that stand out in her mind. One of them was her visit to the Women’s Research Center at the University of Wisconsin. At the center, Ms. Somswasdi met “very dedicated people working very hard despite not having facilities.” As she recalls, “We were in the same boat – housed in a big and prestigious university, yet the center was poor, regardless of the strong commitment levels of the individuals working there.” Her experience at the University of Wisconsin can be summarized in one statement: “Oh – I’m home!”, a statement that further fueled Ms. Somswasdi’s commitment to women’s rights. “It was a confirmation of the need for the hard fight. Although I saw many advancements and

17 Dr. Kathleen Cloud is an Associate Professor at the College of Agriculture, Consumer and Environmental Sciences. She is also the Principal Investigator of the Gender and Agribusiness Project and the former Director of the Office of Women in International Development.
possibilities in the United States, there are still many changes necessary. The [Eisenhower] experience along with the commitment and sincerity of women’s groups enabled me to continue.”

One particularly stimulating meeting that Ms. Somswasdi noted was her visit at the World Watch Institute in Washington, DC. Aside from women’s rights, Ms. Somswasdi and her partner are committed to environmental issues. The meeting proved to be an inspiring afternoon. “It was a very impressive human rights group – active women and men with an outstanding commitment to their work.” As Ms. Somswasdi summarized, “the atmosphere, environment – both physical and spiritual, social and political was wonderful.”

**In Closing**

Since the fellowship, Ms. Somswasdi remains at the University of Chiang Mai. While she is no longer the Director of the Center (she did not want to bend any rules after her term was finished), she still commits 12 to 13 hours a day to her work. She is responsible for fundraising, curriculum development, conducting trainings, and has increased her policy advocacy role. In 2002, she received the Woman of the Year award. True to her humble style, she considered not accepting the recognition. As it turned out, declining the honor was not an option.

She continues to serve as a committee member of the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development, a leading women’s NGO. She is a founding member of the organization, and has served as a member of the steering committee, and the program and management committee since 1986. Her tireless efforts have contributed greatly to the improved livelihoods of women in Thailand and, judging by the fire in her voice, there are many more accomplishments ahead.

As Dr. Suwannarat summarized: “Virada would have succeeded in any event – but I do think that the Eisenhower opportunity clearly provided her both inspiration and conceptual underpinnings to help channel the leadership in a very constructive manner for women, children and minority groups in Thailand.” In the words of Dr. Ekasingh – “I am just concerned that we will not be able to find someone like her to continue the tremendous work she has done.”

Overall, Ms. Somswasdi is grateful for the opportunity to participate in the Eisenhower Fellowship. The experience was invigorating both professionally and personally. She maintains contact with a number of other Eisenhower fellows and has visited and corresponded with them often. She also tries to maintain a degree of connectedness with the Philadelphia office.
Profile at Time of EF Participation

A true and thoughtful civic leader in metropolitan Philadelphia, David Thornburgh, 44, has transformed the Pennsylvania Economy League (PEL) from a purely research-focused “think-tank” to one that has been able to build civic leadership around viable solutions to regional problems of economic competitiveness and government performance. In the process, PEL has become recognized as one of the region's most effective civic organizations and has been highly successful at attracting high-impact economic development projects to this region.

Fellowship Experience

David Thornburgh visited Australia and New Zealand to focus on economic development policy at the state and local level and the role of governance and civic leadership in metropolitan contexts. In the government sector, he met with officials at the national, state, and local levels. Meetings with government officials and civic leaders included visits with the Secretary of the Labour Council of New South Wales, the Senior State Development Officer, the General Manager of Information and Communications at the National Offices of Information Economy, and the President of the Local Government Association in New South Wales.

He also met with leaders of policy organizations similar to PEL. These included the National Director of the Public Policy and Administration Australian Industry Group and the Executive Director of the Centre for Independent Studies. Major corporate leaders and key stakeholders in business leadership organizations that Mr. Thornburgh met included the CEO of Australian Business Foundation, the Executive Chairman of Macquarie Bank Limited, and the Group General Manager at Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited.

Mr. Thornburgh also met with university leaders. In his post-fellowship report, Mr. Thornburgh noted that a meeting with the Chancellor of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology was particularly compelling because it underscored the difficult challenges and questions that Australia must face concerning immigration – challenges that all leaders address in their efforts to improve regional economy.

During an interview, Mr. Thornburgh recalled only one encounter that was particularly memorable. This was a meeting with Mr. Steve Tindall, founder and CEO of “Wharehouse,” a franchise similar to Walmart. Mr. Thornburgh saw him as an energetic, innovative and forward-thinking leader because he spanned the world of business and community development.
Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

In the interview for this case study, Mr. Thornburgh offered a candid perspective of his fellowship experience in Australia and New Zealand. As an American, the Eisenhower fellowship helped broaden his understanding of different cultures, and how members of the international community view U.S. politics and civic behaviors. But, as a policy maker interested in new innovations and models for regional economic development, Mr. Thornburgh suggests his experience fell short of meaningful learning and networking opportunities. He attributes his tepid experience to a combination of poor program design and a general lack of cultural and institutional support for entrepreneurship within Australia and New Zealand.

What Mr. Thornburgh did gain is a much stronger sense of U.S. advancements in the area of entrepreneurship. He came to recognize that the U.S. is on the cutting edge of economic development policy, and unparalleled in the level of sophistication and quality found in the policies, practices and infrastructure designed to support entrepreneurship.

An Eye-Opening Experience

During a dinner in Melbourne, one Australian colleague made a flattering observation that most Americans are unaccustomed to hearing: “You have such a lovely accent!” the colleague told Mr. Thornburgh. A little stunned, Mr. Thornburgh thought, ‘I don’t have the accent! You have the accent!’ In some ways, this exchange epitomized a humbling aspect of Mr. Thornburgh’s fellowship experience. “Being outside your own country,” says Mr. Thornburgh, “gives you a better reflection of who you are.” As his response and interpretation implied, Mr. Thornburgh seemed to realize (more consciously than ever before) that others hold perceptions of Americans that can differ dramatically from Americans’ self-perceptions.

The exchange was also a poignant reminder that the rest of world closely scrutinizes and evaluates American behavior and practices. “As an American, when you spend an extended period of time out of the country, you get a much better sense of how the world views this country. You realize there are a lot of eyes on the U.S., and an intense amount of interest in what this country is up to, and that perceptions of the U.S. are becoming increasingly less positive,” says Mr. Thornburgh.

Managing different perceptions and heightened scrutiny was both challenging and eye opening. Mr. Thornburgh arrived in Australia during a sharply divisive and controversial time in American history – right after the highly contested 2000 presidential election. The world was paying close attention to Florida, and questioning and critiquing the election on a number of fronts. “I was so far from the U.S. and looking at the issue through a telescope, surrounded by people who were intensely curious about exactly what was going on [in the U.S.]. The election was a constant conversation.”

These conversations moved Mr. Thornburgh to think both critically and defensively about U.S. practices. For many Australians, the election raised questions about American civic behavior. “Since everyone votes in Australia, people could not understand why the U.S. has such low voter turnout rates.” Mr. Thornburgh began to reflect on these differences and other issues, “things we would otherwise take for granted.”
Many Australians were also convinced that the election outcomes were driven by politics, a perception Mr. Thornburgh did not agree with. “In response to their politicization of the election, I found myself trying to defend our system.” But Mr. Thornburgh also became critical of some U.S. practices that he believes are responsible for other countries’ negative perceptions of Americans. “Their impressions are a testimony to the reach of the American free press,” he says. “The free press in the U.S. is so out front…to an extreme. We broadcast every detail. We tell stories that are probably not told in other countries.”

**Affirmation of American Ingenuity and Leadership**

Mr. Thornburgh’s meetings with government officials, business leaders and academics helped him delineate differences and similarities between America, Australia, and New Zealand, specifically differences concerning policies and programs to promote entrepreneurship.

One observation about his host countries was that they lacked “a supportive cultural context for entrepreneurship.” Australia and New Zealand, he notes, “were missing people who take risks, for innovating and doing things differently.” Compared to the United States, Mr. Thornburgh observed that Australia and New Zealand were 10-15 years behind in the ways they embrace entrepreneurship and innovation. “I walked away thinking that we in this country have enormous assets. We have a knowledge base, a practice base around entrepreneurship, and there is a cultural appreciation for entrepreneurship that I didn’t see nearly as developed in those two countries.”

As a leader, understanding these differences may have added to Mr. Thornburgh’s confidence. “The experience affirmed that we [at the Pennsylvania Economy League] were doing some pretty cool stuff,” he says.

**Limited Opportunities for Gaining and Sharing Knowledge**

Mr. Thornburgh’s experience helped crystallize his understanding of the U.S. as a world leader in entrepreneurship policy and practice. He also came to recognize that the organization he led was pushing the envelope in strategies and initiatives to create an entrepreneurial climate. For this very reason, Mr. Thornburgh did not gain much new information or knowledge that was useful to his life and work. “I didn’t really see any areas I was interested in,” he says.

Mr. Thornburgh attributes the limited learning opportunities not only to Australia’s and New Zealand’s relatively underdeveloped approach to entrepreneurship, but also to the possibility that his program was not optimally designed. “I did leave wondering whether I could have benefited more had my Eisenhower program been designed better.” In developing his program, Mr. Thornburgh relied on Eisenhower fellows from Australia who came to the U.S. with more insular focuses or less-integrated backgrounds. They “tended to be either very corporate, academic ivory tower types, or very old school capitalists.”

Additionally, rather than traveling to eight different cities, staying in one region for a longer period of time may have afforded a richer learning experience, says Mr. Thornburgh. “As a regional complement, it might have been more interesting to stay put for 3-4 weeks, really get to know a place, participate in the life of that region, and follow its politics.”

Aside from one or two meetings, Mr. Thornburgh did not have much opportunity to impart or share his knowledge about U.S. policies and programs in a context conducive to learning. Most of Mr. Thornburgh’s meetings involved one-on-one situations, where he felt that discussing U.S.
practices could create touchy dynamics. “You don’t really want to come off as the expert,” he says. More roundtables and colloquia to share best practices, brainstorm, and strategize may have minimized these uncomfortable dynamics and engaged everyone in a process of sharing and learning, suggests Mr. Thornburgh.

Opportunities to share the insights he gained on his fellowship with other Americans have also been limited. Though Mr. Thornburgh does talk with Eisenhower fellows who are about to leave for Australia and New Zealand, it is rare to come across others in the U.S. who are interested in these countries from a policy, business, or city planning perspective. “You start talking with people about it, and their eyes glaze over,” he explains.

At the same time, Mr. Thornburgh notes that from an economic development perspective, there have been some critical, missed opportunities to connect with other Americans visiting Australia and New Zealand. A few months after Mr. Thornburgh arrived home, he ran into a Pennsylvania state government trade representative for Australia. The trade representative did not know about the Eisenhower fellowship. Likewise, “we did not even know about the state government’s network, contacts, or this person…” says Mr. Thornburgh, who feels this was a surprising disconnect.

Few Opportunities for Networking

Mr. Thornburgh’s personal and professional relationships “did not expand much,” as a result of his fellowship – a fact that he also attributes to weak program design. USA fellows have few opportunities to build strong relationships with one other, says Mr. Thornburgh. “I was really struck, really struck – I went on an eight-week trip and spent most of it by myself. I felt like a traveling salesman, playing tourist, meeting people here and there, checking things out.” Unfortunately, being alone during this “rifle-shot experience” is also something that all Philadelphia fellows share, he adds.

The experience of USA fellows is particularly striking to Mr. Thornburgh because international fellows coming to the U.S. have ample opportunity to spend concentrated time networking and bonding with one another. “I went to Eisenhower Fellowship’s 50th Anniversary Conference and could see those really intense, powerful bonds.” To this day, Mr. Thornburgh continues to question why the program is not designed for USA fellows to have similar experiences. “We could have planned to spend intense time with U.S. fellows, even if it were only fellows from the Philadelphia region.”

At the very least, bonding with other fellows would have enhanced the actual fellowship experience. “It’s really helpful when you can meet for dinner and crosscheck your experience and perceptions with somebody else living in the same context,” he explains. Mr. Thornburgh also points out that building deeper relationships with other fellows would have helped overcome the sense of isolation and fatigue that accompanies intense travel. “Frankly, it gets kind of lonely. I was on 21 different plane trips…that wears on you,” he admits.

Mr. Thornburgh acknowledges, however, that getting to know other Eisenhower fellows from the Philadelphia region has been “somewhat useful” (though he knew a good number prior to his fellowship). These contacts have not helped him advance his work in any significant way. Rather, “they generally help for gathering intelligence and civic gossip – nothing too dramatic,” he explains.
Minimal Overall Impacts

With few learning and networking opportunities, it is not surprising that Mr. Thornburgh believes the fellowship had very little impact on his work. At most, the fellowship experience offered him big picture, global perspective. “I know quite a bit more about these people, countries, and cities that are thousands of miles away. And you want that global perspective, but it doesn’t enter the realm of what I do on a day-to-day basis,” he says.

Mr. Thornburgh’s colleagues, Mr. Eric Rabe and Mr. Gregg Mellinson, offer a different view on the impact of the fellowship. Mr. Rabe, for instance, believes that Mr. Thornburgh’s experience broadened his perspective of international policy, enhancing his stature as regional leader. “[Prior to the fellowship], he did not spend much time doing international policy work. This experience was an important piece to add to his portfolio, especially because he met with high-level decision-makers.”

Both colleagues note that since the fellowship, Mr. Thornburgh’s goals for PEL changed, and that he has taken the organization to new heights. “A lot has happened since the time he came back. He has really taken PEL to a position that none of us expected to achieve,” says Mr. Rabe. Both colleagues observe that since his Eisenhower fellowship experience, Mr. Thornburgh has transformed the identity of PEL. It is no longer an organization that only produces research about the region’s economy. Instead, PEL takes its research one step further, using data and analysis to engage in well-reasoned activism to stimulate economic development in the region. Both colleagues suggest that PEL’s activism on economic development has made the organization much more dynamic and more noticeable in Pennsylvania.

Though Mr. Thornburgh has remained Executive Director since the fellowship, his colleagues note that his position has been elevated, and he is emerging as one of the regions strongest leaders. “In a region that hardly has a surplus of leadership, Dave’s developed a reputation as a very thoughtful, well-connected policy person,” says Mr. Rabe. Today, he is a considered a leader in public policy thought and action.

Neither colleague could point to how the Eisenhower fellowship was specifically responsible for these changes. In general however, they suggested that the Eisenhower fellowship helped Mr. Thornburgh mature professionally and develop a more demanding view of how PEL could contribute to the region’s economic health.

In Closing

Overall, Mr. Thornburgh says he has not accessed or leveraged greater resources for his work as a result of his Eisenhower experience. While his colleagues give a different view, Mr. Thornburgh frankly admits that the experience “did not have a profound impact on my thinking.” He gives a simple explanation for this feedback, “I guess I knew more than I was learning. I had more to teach than to learn.”

---

18 Mr. Eric Rabe has known Mr. Thornburgh for 6-7 years. He is the vice-president of Verizon Communications and a former chair of the Pennsylvania Economy League (PEL). Mr. Gregg Melinson is a current chair at PEL and a lawyer at Drinker Biddle Law Firm in Philadelphia, PA.
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However, Mr. Thornburgh also admits he would go back if he received an opportunity to share and contribute his ideas and experience. “I’d do it again in a heartbeat,” he says. “If somebody called me an hour later, to work on some detailed 3-year project in Melbourne, I would give it some serious thought,” he elaborates.

It is important to note that Mr. Thornburg’s post-fellowship report provides similar critiques to those he shared in this interview. However, his written report also includes some positive insights and observations specific to each host countries’ development policies. The interview, however, did not surface these aspects of his experience.
Michael Trezzi  
Czech Republic  
SNP, 1992

Profile at Time of EF Participation

Dr. Trezzi's career has proceeded from optoelectronics (Head, Applied Electronics Research, Czech Academy of Sciences) to organizational and financial supervision of international projects to improve the state of the Czech environment. His goals in the United States are to understand the human and social environment of the U.S.A., in order to know the aims and requirements of environmentally sensitive American businesses that might invest in the Czech Republic. Natural contacts for him will be the EPA, AID, institutions coordinating business and economic support for post-communist states; and institutions dealing in computer support of management of environmental projects.

Fellowship Experience

As a Single Nation Fellow from the Czech Republic, Dr. Michael Trezzi sought to bridge the “intellectual language gap” between the East and the West – a gap that was a direct result of the isolation of the Cold War era. Recognizing that limited transatlantic communication had led to a lack of knowledge on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Dr. Trezzi believed that the East as well as the West needed to learn the human and social background of the other. In order for the Czech Republic to be able to fully integrate into the world economy, the country had to learn from the vast experiences of the West. In addition, Dr. Trezzi also sought to identify American businesses with an interest in working and investing in the Czech Republic. He was interested in gaining a greater understanding of the financial flows of organizations like the Environmental Protection Agency and other environmental assistance programs that may have an interest in working with countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Dr. Trezzi also wanted to gain a greater understanding of advances in the information technology field as they related to decision-making and project management.

Twelve years after his fellowship, Dr. Trezzi can still recall the exhilaration of his initial contact with the western world as he consulted with his Eisenhower fellowship Program Officer to set up his agenda for the fellowship. During the six weeks Dr. Trezzi spent in the United States, he participated in over fifty meetings. They ranged from meetings with executives at the Philadelphia Suburban Water Company, where he learned about the economics of running a public utility and compliance with environmental regulations; to meetings with senior staff at Coors Brewing Company and the Department of Ecology in the state of Washington. Dr. Trezzi also met with individuals on the staff of the Environmental System Research Institute to learn about environmental information systems that support decision-making. He met with executives from Engineering Technology International U.S. Inc., an environmental engineering company of Czech origin, and visited their state-of-the-art laboratory. Dr. Trezzi spent a significant amount
of time meeting with the staff of the Environmental Protection Agency at their regional office in Colorado and their central office in Washington, DC. Over the course of two days at the EPA’s regional office, Dr. Trezzi met with senior staff to discuss GIS, data integration, and water management, and to visit a Superfund project. During his two days at the EPA’s central office, Dr. Trezzi met with senior staff to discuss broad environmental policy issues, EPA training courses, and next steps in joint programs.

**Fellowship Outcomes and Impact**

Dr. Trezzi’s nomination for the fellowship came at a particularly opportune moment. The first democratic elections in the former Czechoslovakia had taken place in 1990, and as a result, the government and economy were in a state of reform and flux. Dr. Trezzi recognized that his fellowship was an opportunity to learn from the advances that had taken place in information technology and to examine the integration of public and private financing for environmental infrastructure ventures. Overall, it was a chance to experience “life” in the United States for the first time.

**Broadened Political Perspective**

During his stay in Texas, Dr. Trezzi was the guest of Ambassador Eugene Douglas, former U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Ambassador at Large (1982 –1986). While in Texas, Dr. Trezzi had the opportunity to witness the culmination of the United States’ 1992 Presidential election – which he eloquently described as the “fruits of 200 years of democracy.” While Dr. Trezzi described the campaign as “crazy,” with each of the candidates “throwing dirt” on each other, he was impressed with the agreeable acceptance of President Clinton’s victory once the votes had been tallied. He recalls the post-election as follows: the political divisiveness stopped, no one challenged the election results, President Bush declared that he would work to make the staffing transition at the White House as smooth as possible, and President-elect Clinton said that until the transition took place that President Bush was still the President and he would respect his authority. Dr. Trezzi felt that the Czech Republic could learn a great deal from this process.

In discussing the political process that he observed in all of his meetings in both the public and private sectors, Dr. Trezzi noted that the principle of public/community involvement was a constant theme. He described public involvement as one of the major principles in creating democracy. He felt that by including people in the process of decision-making, both at the government and market levels, individuals experienced a sense of inclusion that led to a feeling of responsibility and voluntary obedience to government regulations.

Dr. Trezzi recounts one of his first meetings with the EPA in Denver, CO when describing his introduction to the principle of community involvement. He was invited to attend a regularly scheduled meeting that the Regional EPA Administrator set up with industrial companies in the region. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss issues dealing with pollution and the private financing of clean-up efforts (if a responsible party is not identified for a particular polluted area, then the site is declared a Superfund area and the clean-up is financed through public dollars). The EPA had realized greater cooperation by involving private companies in the process of policing the pollution in their industry. This level of coordination was awe-inspiring for Dr. Trezzi.
Furthermore, Dr. Trezzi described how the EPA, through the release of information to the public, used community involvement as both an incentive and deterrent for private companies. The EPA publishes the names of companies who are the worst polluters as well as those who are the best from an environmental standpoint. This information not only informs the public on how private companies are performing, but also provides the companies with either positive or negative public relations exposure. Dr. Trezzi viewed this as a low-cost way for the government to reinforce its environmental regulations by establishing a system that encourages a sense of pride and involvement by the public.

**Broadened Economic Perspective**

Dr. Trezzi gained considerable insight on the workings of the market economy and occasionally disproved some of his own preconceived notions. In particular, Dr. Trezzi was under the impression that private dollars financed nearly all services in the United States. He was surprised to learn during his visit to the Seattle Water Department that the municipality or the state owned several of the major infrastructure components of Washington State’s water system (i.e., the wastewater treatment plant, dams, drinking water treatment plants, etc.). In the Czech Republic, the government was focused on the decentralization of services in pursuit of a market economy. However, the abandonment of infrastructure had not proven to be cost effective.

Dr. Trezzi felt that the Czech Republic could learn from the alternate models of environmental infrastructure financing that he witnessed in the United States. Specifically, he felt that the practice of having municipalities assist with the financing of essential services like wastewater treatment could be beneficial to the Czech Republic. He felt that the U.S. model of establishing utility commissions responsible for regulating the prices of services would allay Czech concerns of rising service prices as the result of monopolies.

**Establishing a Global Network**

Despite having earned professional credentials, establishing a successful academic/research career, and then transferring his knowledge to a thriving career in public service, Dr. Trezzi had not had the opportunity to share his knowledge or establish a professional network on a global scale prior to the fellowship. Thus the networking and exposure to like-minded professionals in the United States was a pivotal aspect of his EF experience. Even though Dr. Trezzi did not begin to develop the global network that he now relies on in his professional career until well after his Eisenhower fellowship, the trip greatly influenced his ability to create and maintain international relationships.

During his fellowship, Dr. Trezzi had several meetings with American companies and entrepreneurs interested in working and investing in the Czech Republic. While these meetings were with individuals and companies interested in environmental issues, Dr. Trezzi recognized the potential for investment and growth in all sectors of the Czech Republic as the country integrated into the global economy. Dr. Trezzi’s Eisenhower Fellowship experience instilled in him a sense of confidence and assuredness to operate on a global stage in a way that he had not previously experienced.

**A Pivotal Point: Career Transition**

While the Eisenhower fellowship experience significantly increased Dr. Trezzi’s knowledge of environmental policy, information technology, and project management issues, the most
Prior to 1989, Dr. Trezzi was the head of the Applied Electronics Research Department at the Czech Academy of Science (a low-paying academic department of skilled employees who were not members of the Communist Party). Following the revolution, Dr. Trezzi’s career path shifted as opportunities for professionals who were not affiliated with the Party expanded. While many of his employees left the academy to take positions in the private sector, Dr. Trezzi took a position in the Czech Republic’s newly formed government. Initially, he was the Deputy Director of the Department of Informatics and Education in the Ministry of the Environment, and eventually worked his way up to the Directorship of the Department of International Relations in the Ministry of the Environment.

Before he accepted the Eisenhower Fellowship, a colleague at the Ministry forewarned Dr. Trezzi that others who had participated in similar fellowships abroad had experienced resentment and isolation from some of their supervisors upon their return. This scenario proved true for Dr. Trezzi as well. Not long after his return to the Czech Republic, the Ministry of the Environment had appointed a new Minister with a distinct orientation towards Germany. The new Minister discounted the previous relationships established with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the “western” ideas and new contacts that Dr. Trezzi brought back from his experience. Despite Dr. Trezzi’s experience, he shared that many of his colleagues were more fortunate and were able to benefit their employers from the global networks they had created.

After leaving the Ministry of the Environment, Dr. Trezzi embarked on a successful career in the private sector combining his technological expertise with the contacts and tools he had gained during the Eisenhower Fellowship – particularly his broadened perspective and networking abilities. Dr. Trezzi initially worked as the Country Sales Manager and Executive Director for Motorola as the company launched itself in the Czech Republic. He is currently the Country Sales Manager for Computer Associates CZ, a leading worldwide provider of solutions and services for the management of IT infrastructure, business information and application development.

In summing up his fellowship experience, Dr. Trezzi stated that the Eisenhower fellowship and his professional interactions with the World Bank, the EPA, and many other international and American institutions, changed his perception of the world, society, and ultimately of life. He said that the Eisenhower fellowship was the ultimate touch in shaping his evolved worldview.
Profile at Time of EF Participation

As General Manager and Editor in Chief of Suomen Tietotoimisto (STT), Mr. Vaisanen directs the news agency that acquires daily news for Finnish media. It is an organization in the throes of change. Mr. Vaisanen must manage the agency’s transition from cooperative to for-profit status while ensuring both its business viability and journalistic quality. To gain a fresh perspective on these challenges, he plans to investigate American journalism as well as the role of corporate and political communications. He will visit leading media organizations and communications professionals in all government sectors and will acquaint himself with corporate strategic planning. Mr. Vaisanen is expected to play a significant role in shaping media practice and policy in his country.

Fellowship Experience

Kari Vaisanen’s 10-week fellowship focused on assessing the current status and projected future of American news agencies and the press, and learning how the American media environment defines journalism. Mr. Vaisanen visited several prominent newspapers and publishers such as the Atlanta Constitution-Journal, USA Today, the Dallas Morning News, and the Sun-Sentinel. He also visited national and local television and radio broadcasters, and electronic publications. At Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Missouri, Mr. Vaisanen met with professors and media analysts and learned about their research and projects. Since one of Mr. Vaisanen’s interests was assessing trends in electronic communications, he attended the National Association of Broadcasters’ Annual Conference and participated in the “Internet Business” track of the convening. Looking back on his fellowship, Mr. Vaisanen believes that the experience was valuable overall, but also says “I had absolutely too many [meetings].”

Mr. Vaisanen reflected that his meetings with large publishers, such as USA Today and the Atlanta Constitution-Journal, were highlights of his time in the U.S. He describes the contacts he met with there as being very good business leaders and open to sharing their opinions with him. Mr. Vaisanen said that he had deep conversations with these publishers about American society, the future of media, and upcoming challenges for the field.

In his final report about the fellowship experience, Mr. Vaisanen wrote: “Owing to my crazy hobby of running marathons, I had the best chance of all the fellows to see different American suburbs; richness and poverty.” He trained for and ran the Boston Marathon during his fellowship.
Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

A New Look at Leadership

When Kari Vaisanen came to the U.S. for his Eisenhower fellowship experience, he was just 38 years old and was heading the largest news agency in Finland, STT. In this role, he was managing 116 employees, overseeing research and development programs, striving to increase journalistic speed and quality, and navigating STT’s change from a non-profit to a for-profit business. Prior to working in the media, he had worked for the Finnish government.

Despite his early accomplishments, Mr. Vaisanen says that he did not think of himself as a “leader” before his fellowship. He explains, “There was not so much of an active discussion about leadership in Finland at that time,” and says that his fellowship was the first time he thought deeply about leadership, what it means, and what kinds of people make good leaders. “Talking about leadership was one of the best sides of the whole program.” Now, he describes a good leader as an individual who is reliable and honest; has respect for other cultures and diverse skills for shifting demands; can function in multiple cultures; and shows strength within a team context.

Although Mr. Vaisanen gained new information about the media field and a new context for thinking about leadership, his fellowship has not led to any specific professional-level impacts. Mr. Vaisanen had to resign his position at STT after his fellowship, and subsequently changed fields.

Unrealized Impacts

Mr. Vaisanen’s goals in coming to the U.S. as an Eisenhower fellow were to examine different aspects of American media and broadcasting – including management, corporate sponsorship, and research – and also to compare American media to European (specifically Finnish) media. During his visits to newspapers and newsrooms, he discussed media ethics – for example, the use of anonymous sources; when and if a newspaper should reveal its sources; and in what circumstances a paper should obtain background information. He noted, “at that time, the USA media took more seriously the value of content [than the European media].” In his final report to EF, Mr. Vaisanen wrote, “I find it encouraging to realize that a critical discussion about journalism is arising widely in the United States. It has a wide spectrum, and it seems even possible that there are medias that will take the hopes and wishes of their customers seriously…”

Despite the professional knowledge that Mr. Vaisanen gained during his fellowship, it is unclear that this knowledge was ever shared widely or had impacts on his career. Following his fellowship, Mr. Vaisanen says he had to resign from his position at STT. He explained, “In the media, if something big happens, somebody has to take responsibility. After one huge case, I resigned as the director.” He says that the situation had nothing to do with his fellowship. Since his departure from STT, Mr. Vaisanen has been working in the commercial side of a corporation,

---

19 STT is a private agency that cooperates with Reuters, the Associated Foreign Press, and other news agencies.
20 Mr. Vaisanen said that he did produce a memo for his organization’s board about media trends, challenges, and future plans, based on his EF experience.
where his fellowship experience is not as directly relevant. Mr. Matti Aura, who worked closely with Mr. Vaisanen for five years, explained that currently, Mr. Vaisanen’s position is not at the top level of management in his corporation (as he was in STT), but that he is close to attaining such a level again.21

**Personal Growth and Benefits**

Despite his unplanned career change, Mr. Vaisanen recognizes that EF had some benefits that are unrelated to his job. He explained that in Finland, there exists a perception that Americans can be “fake”—that they make small talk and act very politely, but that they are not really interested in others. Mr. Vaisanen was pleased to find that his encounters did not support this perception and said that the Americans whom he met were sincere and genuine. Because of this, Mr. Vaisanen says that he gained a new (and improved) perspective on American culture. In addition, the professionals he visited were “never too busy” and would talk with him for longer than the scheduled time. They had prepared for the visit and knew about Mr. Vaisanen and his career when he arrived, which improved the quality of the conversations he was able to have. Mr. Aura remembers Mr. Vaisanen talking about EF as a “great experience” and said that Mr. Vaisanen had met many successful contacts in the media field.

Another important distinction that Mr. Vaisanen noticed and was able to learn from is that, “in America, people talk and talk and never come to decisions.” In Finland, he says, the opposite is true—people make decisions at every meeting, but don’t necessarily have the right information to do so. Mr. Vaisanen’s EF experience made him pay more attention to people’s opinions and the importance of open discussion before decisions are made.

Overall, “the most relevant thing for me is that I’m totally following the world and what is happening in the United States with different eyeglasses now… it taught me to respect other cultures more and local people.”

**Relationships and the Cohort Experience**

Mr. Vaisanen feels that he gained a lot through his cohort experience in EF. He says that when meeting new people, it’s good to stop, listen, and think about what kind of experiences and luck they have had. Things in Finland were “in very good order at the time of my fellowship,” according to Mr. Vaisanen. His fellowship cohort provided the opportunity to talk to fellows from countries in less fortunate circumstances. He learned about their struggles to get an education, have a profession, and raise a family. “I guess that’s one big purpose of the program,” he says, “to have the fellows talking and learning with each other.” He is still in touch with individuals that he met during his EF experience, including professional contacts. He says he gained some close friends from the experience, and he tries to meet with some of these individuals whenever he travels to the United States.

Mr. Vaisanen is also in touch with EF alumni in Finland. He knew some fellows even before his fellowship – in fact, he first heard about the fellowship from a friend who had been an Eisenhower fellow before him. Currently, he says that the alumni group in Finland is completely informal – “it’s absolutely and totally social.” He claims that the small size of Finnish society helps to facilitate networking among Finnish EF alumni, who can easily get in touch with each other. While there has been talk of forming a formal EF association, Mr. Vaisanen says that hasn’t happened yet.

---

21 Mr. Aura is currently a Managing Director for the Finnish Port Association.
According to Mr. Vaisanen, it is not unusual for people in Finland to go abroad for programs like EF – “Finland has been an open society long enough that it’s quite common” he says. So it came as a surprise to Mr. Vaisanen that, when he told people about EF and his experience in the United States, they were very impressed by the program. Despite all the other programs that people knew about and had participated in, they found EF to be unique.

Mr. Vaisanen attended the Eisenhower Fellowships’ 50th Anniversary conference in Philadelphia in October 2003, and felt that it was a very useful event that allowed him to re-visit ideas about leadership. He says that there were some very powerful speeches and that it was “a unique opportunity.”
Profile at Time of EF Participation

Mr. Williamson works in the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, but his interests more broadly point to issues of smart government and quality initiatives within local and state government. Mr. Williamson traveled on his fellowship to New Zealand to study widespread governmental reform efforts that have been successful there. He examined reforms at many governmental units and at all levels of professional management. Returning from his fellowship, Mr. Williamson noted that in terms of next steps, “The measure of success will not be taking home ‘good ideas.’ Rather, the challenge will be in designing strategies to get enrollment in these ideas by the major political and opinion leaders.”

Fellowship Experience

Michael Williamson’s fellowship experience focused on exploring the extensive governmental reforms that were implemented throughout New Zealand during the 15 years prior to 1999, both at the central (federal) and local levels. To this end, Mr. Williamson met with more than 100 individuals in 27 organizations across the country and engaged them in discussions about the successes, shortcomings, and lessons learned during the reform efforts. Mr. Williamson says that EF was “superb” in setting up appointments with the right variety and the right types of people: “I got access to people who were at various levels of doing the work that I was really most interested in – from the top levels of the national government down to the local [level], to the day I spent riding around with the animal control officer in the back country.”

Mr. Williamson’s EF itinerary included appointments with officials in the Treasury, the Ministry for the Environment, the State Services Commission, the Prime Ministers and Cabinet Department, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, and the Department of Conservation. He met with professors at Victoria University of Wellington; talked with members of Masterton City Council and Wellington City Council; and visited cities and suburbs such as Dunedin and Auckland to see examples of government reforms implemented at the local level. His itinerary also included meetings with EF alumni from New Zealand.

Mr. Williamson’s fellowship was unique in that his wife and children shared a large part of the experience with him. They were in New Zealand during most of his fellowship, alternately spending time with him and traveling without him to different parts of the country. He says, “I doubt seriously that I would have been able to do the tour [EF] if it had not been for bringing the kids along.”
Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

Michael Williamson has a constant goal that guides his career: improving management in the public sector. In fact, it is not only a career goal but a personal one as well. “Ever since I can remember,” he wrote in his EF application, “there has been a quote on the refrigerator in my mother’s house. It reads, ‘It is as important to make a difference as it is to make a living’... That value was instilled in me, not by mandate, but by example. During the past 23 years, I have worked and studied under talented and capable public sector leaders who led efforts to improve government.” This work has taken place mainly at the state level in North Carolina.

Mr. Williamson credits his EF experience with allowing him to gain skills, experiences and abilities that have helped (and are helping) him to make progress towards his goal. His fellowship allowed him to witness the breadth and scope of New Zealand’s reform efforts and thus expanded his sense of what is possible in terms of reforming entire government systems. “By witnessing the efforts and the accomplishments of my colleagues in New Zealand, I was able to create larger possibilities for what can occur in North Carolina and in this country,” he reflected.

Talking in-depth with those who led and managed the reforms influenced Mr. Williamson as well. He found camaraderie and gained hope from interacting with people who were attempting – and accomplishing – the same goals that he had, but on an even larger scale. These conversations helped Mr. Williamson to re-consider his role as a leader and to re-think the ways in which he could be most effective. “While I saw myself as a leader before,” he explains, “[EF] transformed the role that I saw myself playing – not just inside my organization but inside the larger North Carolina state government. I saw myself as becoming more of a change agent.”

From Managing to Leading

While Mr. Williamson’s goal of improving management systems in the public sector has remained steadfast, his path has varied. In 1999, when he went to New Zealand, he was the Deputy Secretary at the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, where he supervised all administrative functions – the budget, accounting, personnel, etc. – and oversaw operations and organizational change – for example, how to make the organization more strategic and more customer-focused, and how to improve its overall performance. “I was a manager, but I was supportive of a Secretary who was the leader of the organization,” he explains. Ultimately, it was the Secretary that had responsibility for making decisions about how the organization was managed.

Three years ago, in 2001, Mr. Williamson changed positions and became the Director of State Retirement Systems and Deputy State Treasurer. “I actually took over my own organization and became in charge of 150 staff that serve 660,000 members of the public retirement system in North Carolina.” Instead of encouraging someone else to apply the principals that he believed in, Mr. Williamson assumed a position where he could apply them himself.

While his fellowship experience didn’t cause Mr. Williamson to change jobs, it influenced his thinking in ways that made him more interested in leading an organization than in consulting with others about how to lead. “It’s clear to me that the number one issue that leads to success in terms of organizational change is leadership. It’s not resources, it’s not the environment, it is leadership.” During his EF experience, Mr. Williamson says it became clear to him that he could do more to reach his goals by being the director of an organization. “And then, an opportunity
came along... Someone said, ‘I’d like you to come in and take over this organization—it’s in dire need of transformation, and based upon the work you’ve been doing, I think you’d be perfect for the job.’ It was something that aligned with my goals but was not a particular position I was seeking at the time it occurred.”

Chris Russo, who worked under Mr. Williamson at the Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources and has remained in touch with him since his departure, says of Mr. Williamson’s job change: “I think one of the reasons he took that job…was to hone his leadership skills, because here he was more of an administrator. He’s head of retirement over there… He is allowed to be a leader over there… He made changes, he’s turned things around.”

Mr. Williamson says that when he changed jobs, he was able to really apply the principles he studied on his EF, and that consistent application has led to significant results and improvements in the organization. For example, Mr. Williamson cites the use of performance measures to identify and gauge the work done by his organization. If you walk around the organization today, he says, you will see performance measures posted on every wall. Admittedly, some of the principles he has tried to instill have not taken hold as well; but he recognizes that some principles he studied in New Zealand are not well-suited for his current organization.

Sherri Evans-Stanton, who also worked with Mr. Williamson at the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, says, “I know that he has really transformed that group [State Retirement Systems]. And he made a huge difference in the Department, when I was there. Michael is a very demanding person. He pushes people to really explore what they can do and he’s very patient, but he knows what he wants.” Ms. Evans-Stanton describes Mr. Williamson as an excellent listener, a good teacher, and a supportive but demanding colleague. “He’s a dedicated hard-worker, very committed to what he does.”

The Principles of Reform

In addition to performance measures, reforms that Mr. Williamson focused on in New Zealand include contracting out for services, and gathering and utilizing citizen (or customer) input. He says that his visit to the city of Dunedin during his EF provided an excellent example of a local government that had changed the way they deliver services. They had begun to contract out for services that could be more efficiently or effectively performed by private businesses or the community. According to Mr. Williamson, they now use contracts to such an extent that the Streets Department no longer owns a shovel!

Another highlight of Mr. Williamson’s trip was a visit to a suburb, Auckland, where the local government had done extensive work gathering customer input on citizens’ needs and desires. After gathering the input, the town designed their government programs based on the feedback. Mr. Williamson calls this a revolutionary approach, counter to what we often see in the U.S.—government telling citizens what is right for them. “In this case, they had developed a customer-supplier relationship with citizens,” he marveled.

Mr. Williamson describes his emotions during the fellowship as mixed. On one hand, there was elation. Having previously studied New Zealand’s efforts to implement these principles, Mr.

---

22 Ms. Evans-Stanton was the Assistant Secretary at the Department of Environment and Natural Resources when Mr. Williamson was the Deputy for Operations. She has known Mr. Williamson for approximately seven years and she is currently the Director of the Environmental Management Center of the Brandywine Conservancy.
Williamson was elated to see the extent to which they’d been implemented and the successes that they’d had. “For a couple of weeks, I was like a kid at a candy store. It was just unbelievable to me that I would actually see in reality what I had been attempting to implement.” On the other hand, there was depression. Mr. Williamson realized how difficult it would be to accomplish the extent of New Zealand’s reform efforts in the U.S.

“Both emotions were with me when I came back, and the utilization of what I learned did not occur immediately,” says Mr. Williamson. He characterized returning to his job and catching up with his work as an “avalanche” of responsibility. Eventually, though, Mr. Williamson found himself making reference to particular situations and reforms in New Zealand. He did this both internally, when thinking through organizational situations, and externally, when talking with staff and others. “I’m quite certain that my staff became very tired of hearing about New Zealand,” he jokes.

“What it added was another dimension and a reference point to my perspective,” Mr. Williamson explains the immediate results of his fellowship. “Whereas in some cases I’d had theoretical examples [as a result of studying New Zealand’s reforms], I now had practical examples.”

Sharing the Lessons from EF

Mr. Russo says that following EF, Mr. Williamson made numerous presentations about his trip to New Zealand – “at least half a dozen, and those are only the ones I’m aware of.” Mr. Russo says that in these presentations, Mr. Williamson gave an overview of EF and New Zealand, and then talked about the government reform efforts and specific principles. The presentations included best practices and ideas that could be applied in the U.S., and raised issues about how business gets done in the U.S. The audiences included state-level managers, administrators, and directors, as well as people from the private sector.

In addition, Mr. Williamson talked informally about the concepts behind the reforms in New Zealand with his colleagues. Mr. Russo says that he started placing more stress upon the importance of working from the bottom up, as opposed to the top-down model of government. He talked about how it’s possible to have more responsibility and accountability at the local level. Commenting on Mr. Williamson’s management style, Mr. Russo said, “He became less of a micro-manager… I think he got a better perception that decisions can be made, need to be made, where the most information exists. And he realized that he can’t do it all [himself], that it’s a community… I think it gave him a better perspective.”

Ms. Evans-Stanton remembers Mr. Williamson talking about reform efforts and models that he’d seen in New Zealand at Senior Staff Meetings. She also remembers Mr. Williamson’s efforts – and eventual success – at setting up a customer service center at the department, after his EF experience. “We dedicated some staff and set up an 800 number so that people could call in and there was a central place where you could get information on anything from air quality to the zoo, because the department was so different… And then, consistent with Michael’s interest in measuring, he had them track all kinds of things: number of calls, types of calls, response times.” The center is still in place today, according to Ms. Evans-Stanton.

Already an extensive international traveler prior to the fellowship, Mr. Williamson says that his experience in New Zealand did not have major impacts on his worldview. He says that he was well-versed in international issues and cultures before 1999. However, due to the amount of time he spent in New Zealand and to the connections that EF set up for him there, he feels that the fellowship experience allowed him to burrow deeply into the culture. There’s a significant
difference, he said, when you have introductions; when you are dining with the locals; when you’re invited to people’s homes and you sit in their offices. “It allowed me to get under the surface… and that was a kind of insight that I had never gotten before in all of my travels.”

**Before and After the Fellowship: Preparations and Networks**

Mr. Williamson says that he didn’t have much of a cohort experience during EF, which is something he thinks would have been valuable. He also had virtually no orientation. He believes this is related to the fact that his fellowship occurred at the time when the USA program – and specifically the program in Research Triangle, North Carolina – was just getting started. EF gave him the names and numbers of a few alumni to talk to about the program, which he did, and he says that these conversations were very useful.

Despite the lack of an EF cohort at the time of his EF experience, Mr. Williamson has formed relationships with other Eisenhower fellows in the Research Triangle area and is involved in the alumni network there. He says these relationships were unexpected but are very valuable. “Because I work in the public sector, it’s been more difficult for me to form relationships with people in the private sector; I just don’t interact with them on a day-to-day basis.” He credits EF with helping to balance out the variety of his relationships. Mr. Williamson’s EF contacts include both friendships and business/professional contacts.

The alumni group in Research Triangle meets two to three times each year, according to Mr. Williamson, and so far, their activities have mainly been in support of EF – for example, they nominate fellows. Although they have met on several occasions to design a joint project, such a project has not yet come to fruition. Mr. Williamson believes that the network component of EF could be strengthened. He thinks that facilitating the network is difficult because Eisenhower fellows are very busy individuals; however, he feels that EF should be more explicit in communicating their expectation that alumni participate in the network and EF events following the fellowship. He even suggested establishing guidelines for a minimum level of expected participation among alumni.

Concerning his contacts in New Zealand, Mr. Williamson has maintained many relationships but admits that some have lessened over time. One of the relationships he has maintained is with the Regional Manager for Auckland, whom Mr. Williamson had met prior to his fellowship, when she was in the United States. “We’re both intensely interested in the same aspects of governmental reform.” She spent time hosting Mr. Williamson at her organization during the fellowship and provided suggestions for other meetings as well. Mr. Williamson says that they continue to share information, discuss organizational challenges, and swap articles and stories. He refers to this friendship as one that was not due to EF but which was strengthened by it. In turn, the friendship also strengthened his fellowship experience.

**EF’s Influence Over Time**

Mr. Williamson continues to use the lessons from his EF in his work and life, and has no questions about the ongoing relevance of his fellowship. “Because I practice and implement so many of the concepts I saw in New Zealand,” he says, “the fellowship experience is very much in my mind today.” In fact, when he was recently faced with the task of writing a story on customer focus for his organization’s newsletter (every month they feature one of their guiding values), he thought, “I need to go back and pull out some of my materials from New Zealand”, because they did such an excellent job of talking about the customer relationship.”
When asked to what degree his EF experience has been a factor in his overall successes, he admits it is difficult to separate out the effects of the fellowship from other influences. After all, Mr. Williamson has been involved in public sector management for over 20 years – he worked for the first local government in the U.S. to implement quality management principles in 1984, and co-founded an organization to connect people that do public sector quality management work. The very reason he chose to do EF was precisely because it allowed him to develop in an area that he was already interested in. “But, I think the distinction I would make,” he explains, identifying a shift in perspective that he believes is truly due to EF, “is that the fellowship allowed me to create possibilities for success that never existed before.” By seeing first-hand what had been accomplished in New Zealand, and by talking to those who helped make it happen, Mr. Williamson gained a new framework for thinking about what is possible and more information about how to turn those possibilities into realities.
Weihua Zhang
China
MNP, 1998

Profile at Time of EF Participation

Mr. Zhang, chief engineer and vice president of the Shanghai Post & Telecommunications Administration (P&T), works at the forefront of Chinese telecommunications modernization, with overall responsibility for planning and developing the communication infrastructure for Greater Shanghai. His contributions to the telecommunications industry, both technical and managerial, were recognized by the P&T’s “Outstanding Young Intellectual” award. Mr. Zhang is determined to contribute to Shanghai’s becoming “an international economic, financial and trading centre.” His interactions with preeminent industry, government, and research organizations should enhance his ability to provide effective leadership in China’s developing information society.

Fellowship Experience

The swift pace of Weihua Zhang’s six-week fellowship ensured that he obtained access to a plethora of institutions and professional contacts. With stops in more than 20 cities, Mr. Zhang engaged with colleagues in a variety of sectors within the telecommunications field. These included institutions of higher learning such as Columbia University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Temple University; and private companies such as Lucent Technologies, Viewtech, AT&T Asia/Pacific Inc., Bell Atlantic, GTE, Empire One Telecommunications, and America Online. In addition, he took advantage of EF’s ability to open doors within the U.S. government by meeting with representatives from the Federal Communications Commission and U.S. Department of Commerce. Attendance at two trade conferences rounded out his ambitious itinerary.

Fellowship Outcomes and Impact

The story of Weihua Zhang’s Eisenhower Fellowship parallels his journey from inwardly focused engineer to actively engaged global citizen. It takes him from the foundational basis of an undergraduate engineering degree to the more ambitious reach of a Ph.D.; from the sheltered waters of a state-run monopoly to the open ocean of the competitive marketplace; and from the confines of a technical job to the broader world of product marketing and public presentations. But it is an unfinished story. While Mr. Zhang is quick to acknowledge EF’s influence on his career path and momentum, he is candid about his desire to harness more of the program’s energy to improve its services to alumni. It’s a desire that emerges quite naturally from his fellowship experience.
A Practical Beginning

At the time of his fellowship in 1998, Mr. Zhang could have been characterized as the quintessential engineer. Educated at Shanghai Science and Technology University and Fudan University, he served as vice-president of the monopolistic telecommunications provider Shanghai P&T. Because he was in charge of network planning and technical management, his attention was focused more on in-house mechanical and procedural issues than on the wider world. “[Our company] looked like the old AT&T,” he says now, describing the huge, government-affiliated provider as similar to the former U.S. behemoth in its lack of real competition.

But change was coming. As Mr. Zhang prepared to begin his fellowship in the United States, China’s telecommunication industry faced a watershed moment. “It was a very interesting time-point,” he says, equating the dramatic shift occurring in China with the Reagan administration’s earlier deregulation of telephone service in the U.S. in 1984. That deregulation, and a simultaneous court case, had resulted in the breakup of AT&T into a series of smaller telephone companies known as the “Baby Bells.”

With China on the cusp of radical change, says Mr. Zhang, he was surrounded by colleagues asking what could be learned from the American experience. It was this question that shaped the design of his fellowship. A breadth of activities was important to Mr. Zhang, who described his desire to meet with people in all corners and levels of the industry. When requesting meetings, “I selected [sectors including].... government, carrier, manufacturers, [and] universities in America,” he says.

Ironically, Mr. Zhang’s attempt to understand the effects of deregulation, the U.S. telecom industry’s previous major revolution, occurred at the height of U.S. excitement and uncertainty about the effects of the next revolution. His EF itinerary was influenced by the American telecommunications industry’s preoccupation with the consequences of the dot-com boom, including the explosive growth of Internet usage and the rapid increase in consumer demand for telecom services.

The Fellowship in Action

Obtaining a “colorful and dynamic picture of [the] U.S. information industry” was a particular benefit of Mr. Zhang’s fellowship experience, according to a report he wrote for EF soon after his return. Indeed, his report provides a snapshot of a tumultuous period in American industry as seen by an outsider. As he traveled around the U.S., Mr. Zhang witnessed industry debates on topics ranging from the convergence of telecom, computer, and entertainment services to the regulation of Internet telephone service.

Moreover, the instinct for variety that Mr. Zhang displayed while planning his itinerary paid off, as he benefited from in-depth discussions with experts throughout the industry. “I had a very good talk with American government [officials],” at the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), he says, adding that their conversation focused on how the tightly-regulated Chinese environment could shift to a more entrepreneurial model. Other stops included the National Telecommunications & Information Administration in the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.
Just as important as government regulators, however, were Mr. Zhang’s meetings with people with practical or theoretical experience of the revolutionary U.S. transition. Mr. Zhang met with some who had weathered the deregulation period as telephone company employees, working for carriers serving the local or long-distance markets or both. A few connections proved particularly helpful, says Mr. Zhang, who recalls “a gentleman from Sprint” who was especially clear in describing the purpose of reforming the industry. As the changing environment in China provided an opportunity for his own company to understand “how to be better,” says Mr. Zhang, it was valuable to benefit from the accumulated wisdom of his predecessors in the field. “He’s retired [now],” says Mr. Zhang of his Sprint contact. “He gave very good instructions on how to respond to a lot of change.”

EF’s ability to connect Mr. Zhang with academic contacts also proved helpful, he says, noting that he visited several universities. In particular, he mentions the impact of conversations at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Columbia University with professors who had done research on which the new regulations were based. “I got very good knowledge...about the idea of deregulation,” he says. The theoretical information he garnered in these conversions provided historical context and a practical grounding for the rhetoric about the New Economy that was then bubbling in the U.S.

Such rhetoric was also in evidence during other stops on Mr. Zhang’s itinerary, including two industry conferences he attended. Both the National Cable Television Association’s Cable ‘98 conference and the China Telecom conference, which was directed at U.S. companies interested in the Chinese market, provided abundant opportunities for Mr. Zhang to observe debate about then-current issues in U.S. telecommunications (such as the transition from dial-up to high-speed Internet access). In addition to increasing his understanding of the U.S. industry, the conferences offered an opportunity to consider China’s impending shifts in light of the industry’s projected future.

**Impact on Fellow**

While gathering information through interviews and meetings was an important component of Mr. Zhang’s fellowship, assimilating his new knowledge and putting it to work back home was even more important. To that end, Mr. Zhang worked to ensure that the information he was gathering included practical tips. “What I studied in America [that was] most important for me...was how to adapt to this change of environment from the view of operators,” he says. Conversations with telecommunications operators and carriers provided information on how to survive in a time of deregulation, he says, adding that he was particularly eager to speak with people in those areas of the industry because, “operators have a lot of opinions.”

Mr. Zhang recalled that when he returned from his fellowship, few of his colleagues were enthusiastic about the end of the monopolistic system. “It was a very good environment for them,” he concedes, “[but] I told them, ‘Change happens always.’” He admits that he was also not overjoyed at the prospect of change, but says he saw the evolution as “reasonable.” Before long, a small segment of the company was spun off into a new governmental agency resembling an American-style Public Utility Commission. The majority of staff remained with the now-privatized company, renamed China Telecom. Among those who stayed was Mr. Zhang, who noted that his job responsibilities changed as well: “It used to be more planning and technical, and I changed my function to marketing and operation.”

“I opened my mind,” he says, noting that the shift in his duties reflected the influence of the fellowship. “I talked with managers in American companies.... No matter their rank, high or low,
they’re always thinking globally. Their thinking is always outside America,” he explains. “They think about the world.” Mr. Zhang’s observations led to changes in his own beliefs and behavior, expanding his perspective of potential markets for China Telecom and leading him to similarly expand both his company’s website and his own readings.

At the same time, colleagues from telecommunications and related fields were eager to hear about Mr. Zhang’s experiences. “When I finished my [EF] program, a lot of people asked me to give a seminar with them,” he says. His involvement with organizations such as the Shanghai Communications Association and the Shanghai Youth Association produced a snowball effect, eventually leading to a number of speaking engagements. “I calculate more than 20 meetings,” he says. Mr. Zhang’s socially prestigious position as vice-chair of the Shanghai Science and Technology Committee was another avenue to speaking invitations. “I was being invited...to talk about what I learned in America...from the view of academics, and technologies, and also in industry,” he says. With audiences as large as 100 people, Mr. Zhang modestly concedes that his presentations have helped raise the profile of the Eisenhower Fellowships in Shanghai.

In addition to the fellowship experience itself, Mr. Zhang gained inspiration from his fellow EF participants and alumni, whose achievements affected his career and life paths. In particular, he was affected by the fact that other Eisenhower fellows held Ph.D. degrees. “That’s why, after my [EF] program, I used my spare time,” to go back to school on nights and weekends, he explains, noting that he eventually received a Ph.D. in engineering management. Today, he remains in contact with other EF alumni both socially and professionally. “These Fellows have different backgrounds,” he points out. “Some [are] from government, or university.” The mix of sectors is important, he believes. “It’s also good to expand my social area...[not only] for Shanghai [but] China nationwide. I can also find my fellows in government in Beijing...It’s very good for my business.”

**A Return to the U.S.**

Most recently, Mr. Zhang has taken on a demanding new role within his company, returning to live in the United States and serve as president of the U.S.-based branch of China Telecom. It is a natural extension of his more global mindset. “I used to...come from [the perspective of] an engineer. Focus on the technical,” he says. “After the [EF] program, I enlarge my view.” In addition to widening his duties to include more marketing aspects (“I have tried to...create more public relations with social activities”), he has actively worked to provide for other visitors what EF contacts gave him. When he was still working in China, he met with visiting delegations from other countries, including a number from the U.S.

Despite Mr. Zhang’s interest in remaining connected with EF alumni, he does not use EF’s Intra-Ike communication system. And while he praises EF’s smooth organization and management of his fellowship experience, he expresses disappointment at the relative lack of connections among Multi-Nation Program fellows in comparison to Single-Nation fellows. “In China...the SNP is much closer. Of course it’s very good for them because they have a period of time to live and study together [whereas] for me, as a Multi-Nation fellow, [there were] not so many [joint] activities.”

Mr. Zhang’s newly worldwide outlook also prompted another suggestion: “We are the so-called MNP – it should be global,” he notes. “But global connections are not so easy.” One way to rectify that, he suggests, might be to group MNP fellows by common personal or professional interests. Under such a system, EF could choose an annual topic focus for the Multi-Nation Program, selecting all of that year’s fellows from a particular field – such as finance – while
continuing to ensure that participants came from across the public, private, and non-governmental sectors.

**Coming Full Circle**

Perhaps the most enduring reminder of Mr. Zhang’s fellowship experience is a picture of himself with George H.W. Bush, which he now displays in his Virginia office. It makes a vivid impression on American visitors and business contacts, he says. Perhaps less obviously, it also illustrates an observation that Mr. Zhang made in the report he wrote after his fellowship. With a visit to Microsoft’s headquarters fresh in his mind, he noted that Microsoft’s assets could not be evaluated by traditional indicators such as land, manufacturing plants, and inventory. Instead, Mr. Zhang reframed his perspective with a different lens, declaring, “[Microsoft’s] only meaningful assets are contained in the crania of the managers and employees.”

Today, that shift towards a knowledge-based economy is widely recognized. Perhaps equally important is the connection-based economy – the ability of workers to make contact with and gain insight from their interactions with professional and social counterparts around the world. A review of Mr. Zhang’s achievements to date reveals a leader fluent in both currencies.
Appendix A: Description of Case Study Sampling and Methodology

Due to the high degree of variation in the Eisenhower Fellowships program – for example, EF has three distinct programs, operates on several different continents, and selects a diversity of fellows from different fields, backgrounds and age groups – it was important for the case studies to feature the widest variety of fellows possible in a sample of fifteen. We selected the case study sample using random sampling within particular categories to ensure that we would have a mix of fellows from different continents, EF programs, fields, and genders.

The primary characteristics used to select the sample were EF program and fellows’ continent of origin. Using Microsoft Excel, fellows were sorted into EF program and continent categories. OMG randomly selected fifteen fellows in a manner that maximized the variety among the categories. We then examined the balance within the sample along the following characteristics: gender, year of fellowship, professional field, and availability of contact information including an email address. A few replacements were made to the sample because researchers were unable to make contact with selected fellows.

Telephone interviews and a review of fellows’ EF itineraries and final reports were the main data sources for the case studies. For each sample member, we attempted to conduct telephone interviews with the fellow and two key informants—usually colleagues or friends who were knowledgeable about the fellow’s work and accomplishments from the time before the fellowship to the present. The use of multiple perspectives was intended to increase the strength of the case study design by offering differing points of view concerning each fellow and the impacts of their fellowship experience. However, despite our repeated efforts at contacting key informants, it was not always possible to interview two key informants. Two case studies include interviews with only one key informant, and three include no informants.

The data from interviews was used to craft vignettes describing the fellows’ EF experiences and impacts that the program has had on their lives, work, and larger societies. In addition, we cross-analyzed all case studies to examine the frequency of different types of outcomes, which are discussed in the final report for this evaluation.