

THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL SERVICE ON CRITICAL SOCIAL ISSUES

Getting Things Done

MAY 15-16, 2003



1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW • Suite 201 • Washington, D.C. 20036
(Phone) 202-775-0290 • (Fax) 202-833-8581 • www.icip.org

Table of Contents

Forewardiii
Introductioniv
National Service: Getting Things Done1
What is National Service?1
The Impact of National Service3
National Service as a Strategy4
National Service and Three Critical Issues5
Youth Development and National Service9
Hearing from the experts9
Recognizing Challenges11
Identifying Strategies12
Follow-up and Reflection on the Youth Group Discussion14
Rural Development and National Service15
Hearing from the experts15
Recognizing Challenges16
Identifying Strategies: Service as Opportunity in Rural Communities17
Follow-up and Reflection on the Rural Group Discussion18
Independent Living for Seniors and National Service20
Hearing from the experts20
Questions to Consider21
Recognizing Challenges22
Identifying Strategies24
Follow-up and Reflection on the Independent Living Group Discussion24
The Way Forward25
Legislative Perspectives on the Future of National Service25
President Bush: A Call to Service26
“A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum”: Ten Years of National Service26
Plenary Session: Expanding the Impact of National Service27
Funding Perspectives on the Future of National Service31

Table of Contents

Appendices

I. Getting Things Done Participants Directory33
II. Participant Bios43
III. Service Program Directory59
IV. Background Paper on National and Community Service, by Shirley Sagawa76
V. Ten Years of National Service, by Judy Karasik80
VI. National and Community Service: Getting Things Done to Promote Positive Youth Development During Out of School Time, by Shirley Sagawa97
VII. National and Community Service: Service as a Strategy to Promote Rural Development, by Deb Jospin and Lee Carpenter107
VIII. National and Community Service: A Resource for Long Term Care, by Tom Endres117

Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP) was founded in 2001 as a non-profit social change organization that provides expertise, ideas, information, research, and advocacy support in the United States and around the world to develop and strengthen policies and programs that promote civic engagement through service.

ICP supports the development of innovative programs and policies through a variety of strategies. Recent work includes developing pathways for young people who serve, building capacity through regional centers in Latin America and southern Africa, conducting research to assess the youth service policy environment worldwide, awarding small grants to support innovative youth service policy development around the world, and hosting national and international forums. ***ICP*** has worked with numerous universities, NGOs, national and local governments, and multilateral organizations in over twenty countries on six continents.

Foreword

BY SUSAN STROUD

This year, the tenth anniversary of the creation of the Corporation for National Service, is a time to reflect on the impact of national service in our nation. In recent years, a great deal of attention has been focused on the ways that national service encourages civic participation. The goal of this forum was to look further into another important purpose of service — to address unmet community needs.

Innovations in Civic Participation chose three critical social issues to provide the lens through which to examine how national service “gets things done.” We commissioned experts to synthesize existing research on the community impacts of national service, and to look at each of the three issue areas — youth development in out of school time, rural development, and independent living for seniors — to help us understand how service is both a useful tool and a strategy for meeting a broad range of critical social needs.

At our Forum on May 15–16, 2003, we convened more than 100 national service program leaders, experts in the fields of youth policy, rural development, and aging; policy makers; and government and private sector funders. Through two days of discussions, this group shared information about barriers, best practices and building an action agenda for the future, and began a dialogue to inform the shape and scope of future national service policies. The discussion is summarized in this report.

We are grateful for the support of The Atlantic Philanthropies, Carnegie Corporation of New York,

Ford Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, Surdna Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Our cosponsors for the Forum were the National Council on the Aging, the National Collaboration for Youth, Rural LISC, AARP and the Grantmaker Forum for Community and National Service. We are deeply appreciative of their involvement and support. We also assembled a working group on each issue, the members of which were very helpful in fleshing out issues and connecting us with the key organizations and individuals in each issue community.

Many people contributed to the Forum and series of papers. We are particularly grateful to the authors of the papers — Shirley Sagawa, Deb Jospin, Lee Carpenter, Judy Karasik, and Tom Endres. In addition, Shirley Sagawa and Deb Jospin offered invaluable assistance with all aspects of the Forum — from helping to conceptualize the Forum to drafting this report. The staff of ICP, especially Erin Rodgers, was enormously valuable. Jean Hwang and Linda Marson lent their expertise in design and public affairs.

We consider this work to be the beginning, not the end, of a dialogue. We hope that this effort will inspire new thinking about an old idea — national service as a strategy “to get things done” — and create an agenda for collective advocacy and action on behalf of national service programs and policies.

Introduction

Over the last decade, national service has impacted the lives of countless Americans — including the 250,000 alumni of AmeriCorps and the millions of seniors and youth serving in their own communities. The positive effect of their efforts on the lives of others is a largely untold story. This year, the tenth anniversary of the creation of the Corporation for National and Community Service, is the time to look back and review the impacts of national service, as well as to think creatively about the future of national service as an important strategy for addressing critical issues in communities across the country.

To this end, Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP) undertook an initiative to explore the impact of national service on three critical social issues: youth development in out of school time, rural development, and independent living for seniors. First, ICP commissioned a series of papers providing a fresh look at the impact of national service in communities, as well as a first-ever examination of the impact and potential of national service in each of the three issue areas. Second, ICP hosted a national forum in Washington, D.C., on May 15 and 16, 2003, which brought together more than 100 national service program leaders, experts in the fields of youth policy, rural development, and aging, policy makers, government and private sector funders, and national service volunteers, many of whom did not know each other prior to the forum.

Over the two days in the International Trade Center, these national leaders heard from experts in each of the three issue areas, national service program directors, and policymakers. Through facilitated small group sessions,

they engaged in a rich dialogue about the ways in which national service volunteers are currently addressing issues related to youth development, rural development, and independent living. This meeting of minds engendered innovative ways to achieve greater impacts. Many participants left with new ideas, partnerships, and plans to advance the cause.

This report summarizes the major sessions of the Forum, lists the recommendations formulated by the participants in their small groups, and provides background information about the speakers as well as a roster of participants and a program directory*. What it does not capture are the many small conversations and informal agreements made among participants during the session breaks. In the end, these connections may be among the most important outcomes of the initiative.

ICP staff have developed a plan for future activities to continue the work begun in the Forum — to focus on national service as a strategy to address a broad range of important social issues. We also want to build on the efforts begun at the Forum to strengthen new constituencies for national service among the issue groups. The planned activities include three one-day sessions over the next year in three different locations across the U.S., each focusing on one of the issue areas addressed at the Forum. We will seek co-sponsoring organizations and funders to join us in the planning of this series of meetings. Late in 2004 we plan to hold a policy seminar in Washington, DC for policy makers to summarize the recommendations from the Forum and the follow up meetings, as a way of informing the legislative process.

* CD and email versions

The Global Service Institute defines national service as “an organized period of substantial engagement and contribution to the local, national, or world community, recognized and valued by society, with minimal monetary compensation to the participant.”

NATIONAL SERVICE: Getting Things Done

What is National Service?

Susan Stroud opened the Forum with an introduction to programs funded by the Corporation for National Service, and the results of research regarding their impact.

‘National service’ is a phrase that has many different meanings for different people. In the US the term is sometimes used to describe full-time service programs that are sometimes linked to benefits, such as money for education and training. Military service is often included in this definition. Others consider national service to be service in government funded and run programs, such as programs funded by the Corporation for National Service, whether the program is full-time or part-time, stipended or uncompensated.

Defined broadly, national service in the US has figured in important priority efforts of many presidents, including **President Franklin Roosevelt’s** Civilian Conservation Corps, intended to provide jobs for unemployed youth who worked to enhance America’s national parks and other civic projects; **President Kennedy’s** Peace Corps, which addressed foreign policy objectives; its domestic counterpart, VISTA, created during the **Johnson** Administration as a part of the war on poverty, along with the Foster Grandparents program; and the Senior Companions Program, the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), and other older-American programs created during the **Nixon** administration as part of an effort to support productive aging.



Susan Stroud, executive director,
Innovations in Civic Participation

The last two decades have seen a dramatic expansion in government support for national service. **President George Bush** requested government funding for the Points of Light Foundation with the goal of encouraging more Americans to volunteer. This legislation also provided funding for a Commission on National and Community Service, which funded Congressionally-designed service-learning and youth corps programs, as well as a demonstration program for full- and part-time national service. **President Clinton** proposed the AmeriCorps program as a strategy to enable young people to earn

money for college or to pay back student loans through a year of full-time service or its part-time equivalent. His legislation created the Corporation for National Service (which consolidated the Commission on National and Community Service and the ACTION agency). During the Clinton Administration, service was a core strategy employed in the America Reads initiative to help all children read independently by third grade, as well as a part of disaster relief efforts and other initiatives. Most recently, **President George W. Bush** created the Freedom Corps, an initiative to engage service participants in homeland security efforts.

Today, most of these federal programs continue to receive government support. Federal support comes from several different agencies, including the Peace Corps, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which administers the *YouthBuild* program, and the Department of Education, whose *College Work Study* program mandates that colleges and universities use a portion of their funding for commu-

nity service placements. However, the *Corporation for National Service* is the only agency charged with engaging Americans of all ages and backgrounds in domestic, nonmilitary service to help strengthen communities. It provides funding for three major program categories:

- *Learn and Serve America* supports service-learning programs in schools and community organizations that help nearly one million students from kindergarten through college meet community needs, while improving their academic skills and learning the habits of good citizenship. Learn and Serve grants are used to create new programs or replicate existing programs, as well as to provide training and development to staff, faculty, and volunteers. Funding is provided through state education agencies, state commissions on national and community service, nonprofit organizations, Indian tribes, and U.S. territories, which then select and fund local service-learning programs. Institutions of higher education and consortia are funded directly.
- *Senior Corps* is a network of programs that tap the experience, skills, and talents of older citizens to meet community challenges. It includes three programs. RSVP, one of the largest volunteer efforts in the nation, engages people 55 and over in a diverse range of volunteer activities. Approximately 480,000 volunteers serve an average of four hours a week at an estimated 65,000 local organizations through 766 RSVP projects. The *Foster Grandparents Program*, through its local grantees, enables income eligible individuals 60 and over to serve 20 hours per week in schools, hospitals, correctional institutions, daycare facilities, and Head Start centers. The more than 30,000 Foster Grandparents serve 275,000 young children and teenagers. They receive \$2.65 an hour for their service. The *Senior Companions Program* through its local grantees enables income eligible individuals 60 and over to serve 20 hours per week to provide assistance and friendship to adults who have difficulty with daily living tasks, such as grocery shopping and bill paying. The 15,500 Senior Companions serve more than 61,000 adults. They receive \$2.65 an hour for their service.
- *AmeriCorps* is a network of national service programs that engage more than 50,000 Americans each year in intensive service to meet critical needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment.

AmeriCorps members serve through more than 2,100 nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations. Full-time members receive living allowances, health care and child care benefits, and education awards of \$4,725 for each year of service (living allowances and education awards are available to part-time members on a pro-rated basis). AmeriCorps is made up of three programs:

- In *AmeriCorps*State and National*, more than three-quarters of grant funding goes to Governor-appointed State Commissions, which in turn distribute and monitor grants to local nonprofits and agencies. The other quarter goes to national nonprofits that operate in more than one state. The organizations receiving grants are responsible for recruiting, selecting, and supervising AmeriCorps members. Between 1994 and 2003, a quarter of a million AmeriCorps members served through more than 2,100 nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations such as Habitat for Humanity, Boys and Girls Clubs, public schools, and Head Start Centers.
- *AmeriCorps*VISTA* members serve full-time for a year in nonprofits, public agencies and faith-based groups to help lift individuals and communities out of poverty. Each year, about 6,000 AmeriCorps*VISTA members serve in 1,200 local programs selected by Corporation for National Service state offices.
- *AmeriCorps*NCCC* is a 10-month, full-time residential program for men and women between the ages of 18 and 24, intended to combine the best practices of civilian service with the best aspects of military service. Members serve in teams of 10 to 15 members based at one of five campuses across the country but are sent to work on short-term projects in neighboring states. Approximately 1,200 members serve in AmeriCorps*NCCC each year.

Of course, not all organized service programs receive federal support. With funding from foundations, corporations, individuals, faith-based organizations, and state and local government, service programs are organized by nonprofit organizations sponsoring volunteer programs; faith-based organizations; civic organizations; employers; and others who see a role for volunteers in achieving their missions.

The Impact of National Service

Susan Stroud observed that of the Corporation's three major programs, *AmeriCorps* has by far received the most attention from Congress. As noted above, AmeriCorps members devote one to two years of full-time intensive service (or its part-time equivalent) to meet critical needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment. Some conservative members of Congress have opposed the living allowance and benefits received by AmeriCorps members. However, research¹ demonstrates that these benefits are critical to ensuring that low- and middle-income individuals are able to participate. The AmeriCorps education award has also proved controversial, although research shows that seven in ten AmeriCorps members say this award is necessary to achieve their educational goals, and it is an important recruitment tool.

The Forum focused not on member impacts, but on community impacts. Stroud outlined the findings of ICP's report, **National and Community Service: Ten Years of National Service**, which draws on research evidence and interviews of program directors to determine whether national service is successful in four important areas.

- First, the report found that national service *expanded programs* in communities across the country, serving millions of people, generating millions of volunteers, and providing service that far exceeds the cost of the program. For example, *Seniors for Schools*, with funding from the Senior Corps, recruited, trained, and supervised adults over the age of fifty-five to help children read. In the program's first three years, the seniors tripled the number of students receiving help

and doubled the number of its volunteers and the number of schools served.

- Second, national service participants deliver *high quality* service. Cross-cutting evaluations of AmeriCorps, K-12 and Higher Education Learn and Serve America, and all three major Senior Corps programs found that the programs have strong community impacts. For example, an independent evaluation of the Seniors for Schools program found that nearly 60% of the students increased their reading skills by one full level or more, and 40% were reading at their expected grade level by post-test — despite the fact that 94% of students tested had started the year below their expected reading level, some by two levels or more. 92% of all students tutored improved their reading skills. Tutoring programs conducted by AmeriCorps had similarly strong results.

In addition to delivering high quality services, some national service programs have played a role in *enabling professional service providers to enhance the quality of their programs*. For example, in the child care field, Plus Time New Hampshire AmeriCorps members organize information and education events for child care program staff, while AmeriCorps members serving through the Action for Children Today (ACT) program in Chapel Hill, North Carolina,

provide educational release time for teachers participating in an early childhood scholarship program.

In the field of independent living, a study of the Senior Companions Program found that the older volunteers provided a *vital communication* link between clients and professional staff. Senior Companions served as client advocates, notified staff of changes in client behavior, functioned as the 'eyes and ears' of the agency staff, and communicated with family members on behalf of the agency.

Although the Forum did not focus on the impact of AmeriCorps on the members themselves, Stroud reported that there is a body of research that documents that AmeriCorps:

- Improves members' life skills (such as communication, interpersonal, problem-solving, understanding organizations, and using information technology). Members whose skills were the lowest upon entering the program gained the most.
- Increases members' levels of civic engagement — strengthening their commitment to focus on community concerns and be part of a civil society that deals with social issues.
- Increases the educational attainment of members.

¹ Please see "National and Community Service: 10 Years of National Service", by Judy Karasik, for more information and references.

Finally, it is worth noting that the studies addressing quality of service describe programs that have *strong systems for training and supervising national service participants*, which add to the cost per participant. Rigorous research-based practices and assessment systems that contribute to program improvement are not possible to incorporate without training and quality control throughout the term of service.

In addition, studies indicate that *resource limitations and uncertainties regarding AmeriCorps funding have stressed programs' ability to hire and retain quality staff and acquire the funding they need to sustain the program*. Although the day-to-day control of national service programs takes place at the local level, *federal resources and priorities have a significant impact on the quality of service delivered*.

- Third, national service, particularly AmeriCorps, encourages and enables community organizations to *collaborate at the local level*. A study by Aguirre International, looking at a wide cross-section of AmeriCorps programs, found two out of three institutions involved with AmeriCorps members felt that the program fostered active community collaboration between their agency and other institutions, and three out of four thought that AmeriCorps was doing a good job helping community organizations work together. Nearly 70% felt that AmeriCorps had done a very good job at changing the ways in which organizations worked together to provide direct services.

For example, a homeless coalition used its AmeriCorps members to help form collaborative partnerships with more than forty other organizations. As a result, it raised awareness of homelessness issues among other service area providers, connected homeless clients to other social service or community-wide agencies, and, incidentally, motivated providers to streamline existing program management systems. Studies suggest that AmeriCorps has been



Stephen Goldsmith, chair, Corporation for National Service and special advisor to the President on Faith-based and Nonprofit Initiatives

similarly successful at strengthening links between schools, community organizations, and businesses, organizing referral networks, bringing together organizations that did not usually work together, and improving services by eliminating inter-agency bottlenecks.

- Finally, national service encourages *young people to enter careers in fields experiencing shortages*. Teach for America, which recruits college graduates into hard-to-fill teaching positions, is the most prominent AmeriCorps grantee identified with attracting talented young people to serve in shortage professions.

However, participants from many other national service programs find that their service experience has a significant impact on their interest in working in underserved fields.

The opportunity to explore future job and educational interests is the second most common reason given for joining AmeriCorps, and as a result of their experience, many members' career plans become more community-oriented. Learn and Serve Higher Education initiatives build the knowledge and skills of the students who serve in the community. Even elementary and secondary students may be influenced by their service experiences to think about or learn more about a future career or job.

National Service as a Strategy

Stephen Goldsmith reflected on the role of national service in delivering social services. He discussed his experience as mayor of Indianapolis trying to find the correct balance between the extremes of minimal government participation and complete reliance on government bureaucracy for the delivery of services. Solutions that involve government resources and decentralized neighborhood based delivery systems help strike the right balance.

These collaborations enhance the ability of the

nonprofit sector to engage ordinary citizens as volunteers and to simplify the coordination of services at the community level, which in turn makes these services more responsive to families. For example, families on public assistance may have a range of barriers to self-sufficiency — childcare, transportation, job training, domestic violence, drug problems, or disability. Goldsmith argued that a control-and-command, rule-driven bureaucracy cannot respond to the different needs of families as effectively as neighborhood-based organizations that can offer a range of assistance. Goldsmith called on policymakers to support non-partisan community and national service participation in these community solutions as yet another important way to help people whom prosperity has left behind.



Carol Kuhre, executive director,
Rural Action

The AmeriCorps*VISTA team works with communities of place (village, county, watershed) or with communities of interest — such as farmers or entrepreneurs working on a cluster strategy for economic development. They are trained in the principles and techniques of “Asset-based Community Development” to listen, support, link, and network citizens who want to improve their communities, economies, or the environment.

This strategy has yielded results. For instance, for the first time in 60 years, the community has returned fish to some of the tributaries of the Monday Creek Watershed. 70 woodlot owners have joined the Roots of Appalachia Growers Association, a mutual self-help association that discourages owners from cutting their forest for a large, “one time in 50 years” income infusion at the expense of profitable, environmentally preferable alternatives. Struggling farmers have come together for ‘economies of scale,’ to sell their produce to institutions such as restaurants, schools, and universities.

Rural Action AmeriCorps*VISTAs have also worked with 12 communities to gather oral histories, create murals, dramatize them and now market the murals as a Mural Corridor for purposes of low-impact heritage tourism. AmeriCorps*VISTAs have also worked with local musicians to

create a CD of unique Appalachian Ohio music, to create a tool-box for communities wanting to know what it takes to develop a mural, to produce an award-winning video on teen depression and the arts, and to establish a youth poetry project that published a youth poetry manual.

Finally, Rural Action believes that working with youth is crucial for creating a healthy Appalachian Ohio. The program works with over 4,000 young people in an

National Service and Three Critical Issues

Five program directors provided illustrations of ways in which national service addresses key issues in their communities.

Rural Development

Carol Kuhre described the way that AmeriCorps*VISTAs have helped to build the capacity of her group, a membership-based organization of 500 citizens.

Twenty-six AmeriCorps*VISTAs work out of storefront offices in six locations throughout the Appalachian counties of Ohio where the level of poverty is 28% and unemployment can be as high as 19%. AmeriCorps*VISTA volunteers serve as field organizers — locally recruited individuals who provide a grass-roots perspective — and externally recruited technical specialists including hydrogeologists, cultural geographers, and media specialists are retained in a collaborative effort.

Rural Action AmeriCorps*VISTAs follow four steps:

1. Locate people with vision at the grassroots level
2. Build community empowerment, including skills and confidence for social improvement
3. Encourage cooperation, collaboration and networking
4. Stimulate capacity building and long-term sufficiency."

Environmental Learning Program that operates both in-school and after-school programs; another program that blends service-learning and philanthropy through the creation of youth-grantmaking boards in underserved schools; and still other efforts focus on the school funding and facilities problems in Ohio.

Kuhre believes that even more lasting than any of the above outcomes is the development of civil society. While single issue groups have won some victories, their victories may be short-lived and organizations disappear quickly once their issue is resolved. In contrast are organizations that create what has been called “free social space” in which people can learn democratic values, obtain alternative sources of information, and act on their values and beliefs. Volunteers want to make a difference but often view their contributions in an individualistic manner. National service volunteers placed within Rural Action come to understand that social reconstruction is an effort between private and public spheres and requires collective effort, not just the acts of heroic individuals.

Rachel Tompkins shared **Kuhre’s** enthusiasm for national service as a strategy for promoting rural development. She cautioned that rural development is “not everything good and useful that people do in Rural America,” but rather, “building local wealth” by strengthening leadership and increasing capital assets through entrepreneurial activity. This leads to the creation of new community infrastructure — new organizations or new collaborations of organizations that enable communities to provide services that previously were not available, such as early education, job training, health care, and recreation.

A good example of national service working in rural development can be found in Lubec, Maine, which experienced a dying ocean fishing industry. High school science students and teachers created an aquaculture research lab to study a potential new fishing industry for the community that would establish

small businesses for people who once ran fishing boats. The students created business plans, conducted research on the care and feeding of species, started up demonstration enterprises, and explained their work to the community. With support from Learn and Serve America, students made a video on the history and importance of the marina, which helped them obtain funds to repair storm damage.

Not only did the students’ service help to build the local economy, it also required them to apply high levels of academic skills, engage in group planning and decision making, and present their ideas and conclusions to public audiences. Tompkins reported that

underachieving and unmotivated students became engaged and every student had a chance to work with adults that were neither teachers nor parents — all in a common enterprise of importance to the community.

Tompkins believes that schools, teachers, and young people are intellectual resources for persistently poor rural communities. Engaging students in real work on community problems makes it possible to help them meet high academic standards and learn about being contributing citizens. This strategy may help reduce ‘brain drain’ from rural places as young people see

promise and possibility in their hometown. The Rural School and Community Trust calls this ‘place-based learning.’ The service-learning community calls it ‘Community Development Oriented Service Learning.’ “Whatever you call it,” concluded Tompkins, “it is good for both students and rural communities and leads to measurable outcomes of rural development.”

Youth Development

Sister Katherine Corr discussed her faith-based organization’s partnership with AmeriCorps. Committed to developing youth through education, her program deploys AmeriCorps members to tutor children in reading and math and offer after-school and summer enrichment programs. Last year, through the



Judy Karasik, author of *Ten Years of National Service* forum paper, looks on

service of 248 full-time AmeriCorps members, more than 10,000 children in inner city schools and low-income neighborhoods benefited. Based on standardized test scores and school report cards, 80 of the children served improved their skills by at least one — and often two — grade levels.

In some cases, members have been social entrepreneurs on behalf of the children they serve. For example, at an elementary school in Baltimore, two Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program

AmeriCorps members took note that children had nowhere to play outside. These members turned a trash-filled courtyard into a colorful playground with hopscotch courts, four-square areas, and a large circle for group games. They also started girls' and boys' basketball teams for seventh and eighth graders.

A few years ago, a Notre Dame AmeriCorps member,



Sister Katherine 'Sissy' Corr, executive director, Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program; **Rachel Tompkins**, president, The Rural School and Community Trust

Sasha Lotus, showed extraordinary commitment and courage when she started a program for teenage drop-outs in the Edgewood public housing project in Washington, DC. Contending with the teens' very real issues, like drug abuse and drug dealing, she was nevertheless successful in helping many obtain their GEDs. The program is still going strong and is being replicated in Virginia. The Edgewood program is in partnership with the Community Development Corporation and Sasha is now on staff as the Career

Enhancement and Skills Coordinator. This illustrates that members' service with Notre Dame Mission Volunteers has an effect on the choices they make after their formal period of national service is completed. Last year, 91% of members stated in an end of the year survey that they were very likely to continue to volunteer in the community after AmeriCorps. Nearly half said they intended to enter the teaching profession.

"The great stories we have accumulated over the years to illustrate the difference Notre Dame AmeriCorps has made in the lives of students and members would fill several volumes. One of my favorite stories is about Toresa Jenkins, a member from Cincinnati. Toresa was forced to drop out of college for financial reasons. Providentially, she met a sister of Notre Dame who invited her to become a full-time Notre Dame AmeriCorps volunteer. Unsure of her future direction, Toresa accepted this challenge. She went on to serve two years at St. Francis School, where she tutored children in reading and writing, directed the after-school program, and launched a successful summer program. It became clear that Toresa was a 'natural' as a teacher. Her students thought she was one in a million!"

"For Toresa, a neon sign lit up saying, 'Teaching is for me!' With the help of the education award through AmeriCorps, Toresa returned to college and graduated from Xavier University. She is now pursuing a successful teaching career in a public school in Cincinnati. Toresa's life has been changed just as she is changing the lives of all those she teaches."

— Sister Katherine Corr

Vincent Pan offered another program example marrying service and youth development. His organization involves local college students in providing children and youth from low-income neighborhoods with the academic skills and learning opportunities they need to succeed. At the same time, the program promotes the undergraduates' development as leaders motivated to effect social change.

Through Heads Up AmeriCorps, 250 college students provide daily after-school tutoring and summer learning programs for 640 students K-6th graders in eight high-poverty DC neighborhoods and schools. 80% of the students served are African-American and 18% are Latino. For three hours each school day afternoon and all day during the summer, Heads Up children are safe, working on reading and math, and developing relationships with caring adults. Frequently, Heads Up is only child-care option for parents.

Pan points to three unique aspects of his program. First, the commitment and intensity of effort by the college students makes a difference. The program encourages this commitment by providing AmeriCorps education awards to some members, providing housing near the neighborhood locations during the summer, offering a three-week training program for the summer program, and requiring a substantial time commitment: two full days each week during the school year and at least 40 hours per week during the summer.

Second, the students who serve are diverse: two-thirds are students of color, which is rare in socially



L to R: Vincent Pan, executive director, Heads Up; Andrea Turner, director, Senior Companion Program for the City of Oakland, California

segregated campuses. Most receive financial assistance while in school. No single academic major or concentration dominates.

Third, the program employs service-learning to encourage the undergraduates' development as civic and social change leaders. Seminars and trainings promote critical thinking about urban poverty and introduce fields of education and youth development. As a result, half of the students involved say they are

more inclined to become teachers or to pursue careers in public service.

Independent Living

Andrea Turner described the significant impact these older national service participants have in her community. Senior Companions are assigned to a small number of frail elderly, helping them to remain in their own homes. They also provide support to family members.

Because of the frequency of visits and length of time the Senior Companions are able to spend with each of their clients, they are able to serve as 'eyes and ears' for professional staff, alerting the staff to changes in the client's health or well-being that require attention. They take clients to appointments, and relieve family members caring for older loved ones so that family members can take care of other needs. However, according to Turner, perhaps the most important thing Senior Companions do is provide the caring companionship that frail older Americans need but so often lack.

Youth Development AND NATIONAL SERVICE

Irv Katz called on the youth development field to “dig deeper” and explore both the “challenges to youth development writ large” and the opportunities for community and national service to help meet them. He observed that a significant number of national service volunteers are involved in youth serving agencies; as a result, a lot of knowledge has been accumulated that could be exploited. He also noted that the group participating in the forum included a great diversity of organizations, from some that were many decades old to those that were only recently established.

Michael Tierney described the work of his program in isolated and otherwise disenfranchised rural communities, where some children face a two-hour bus ride to go to school. His community center is the only public building for a half hour drive in any

direction, in an area with no other recreational opportunities. Due to isolation and lack of services, as many as 80% of area children suffer from behavioral health challenges. Tierney stressed that “you cannot have youth development if you are categorical in your funding or age restrictive.”

The core premise of Tierney’s after-school, summer, and weekend program, which focuses on elementary school students, is to teach children how to dream while providing a range of support to help them succeed. The program has benefited from partnerships with Save the Children and the Corporation for National Service, which has supported AmeriCorps*VISTAs, Promise Fellows, and other AmeriCorps members. Many national service participants are parents of children in the program. These parents start as



Standing: **Irv Katz**, president and CEO, the National Collaboration for Youth
Seated (L to R): **Ira Harkavy**, associate vice president and director, Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania; **Joanna Lennon**, executive director, East Bay Conservation Corps in Oakland, California; **Michael Tierney**, executive director, Step by Step, Big Ugly, West Virginia

volunteers; the most committed become two-year AmeriCorps members, and a few go on to become AmeriCorps*VISTAs, where they round out their job skills with experience in program management and fundraising. Some go on to full-time jobs with non-profit organizations, while others, because of their negative experiences with education, need a higher level of support to make use of their education awards and to continue on to full-time employment.

Joanna Lennon has used national service to enable her organization to develop models that can be replicated nationally. Her program involves about 200 at-risk young adults, who are mainly people of color. These young corps members are AmeriCorps members. They run a recycling program and perform other types of service while they work toward a high school diploma or GED certificate.

Lennon's program also operates Project YES (Youth Engaged in Service), which pairs college graduates with classroom teachers to bring service-learning to schools across the country. Through extensive national partnerships with nonprofits, faith-based organizations, and schools, East Bay Conservation Corps also operates a charter school with the goal of becoming a template for public education. AmeriCorps, AmeriCorps*VISTA, and Senior Corps members all serve at the charter school. Lennon ended her remarks with the observation that service should be integral to how we educate children. "If we don't start looking at our young people as a resource that has something to offer, we are in big trouble...in this country," she concluded.

East Bay Conservation Corps

The EBCC is a nonprofit educational organization dedicated to promoting youth development through community service and environmental awareness. Their various programs are designed for youth of all ages, and include the CorpsMember Program, Project YES (Youth Engaged in Service), the AmeriCorps Literacy Initiative, the Institute for Citizenship Education and Teacher Preparation and the Elementary Level of the EBCC Charter School (serving grades K-5).

Please see www.ebcc-school.org for more information.

Ira Harkavy issued a challenge: "How do we educate students to be creative, contributing democratic citizens in life in a genuine collaborative way?" The University Assisted Community Schools, works with 10,000 children and family members in Philadelphia, providing an extended day program, a Saturday program, and community service connected to core subjects.

Harkavy observed that "human beings learn best when they focus on real problems." The university's first national service program was part of the Corporation for National Service's 'Summer of Service' that preceded AmeriCorps. The program focused on children's health by immunizing the population of west Philadelphia. Additional support from the Corporation helped the University develop a summer service corps for university students to help area schools expand community connections. Through another program, AmeriCorps*VISTA members joined senior citizens and members

of local congregations to run digital divide projects with schools and churches throughout western Philadelphia, placing over 500 computers in 13 community-based computer labs in the last two years. Most recently, the university has received a Learn and Serve America grant to fund a network of higher education institutions in Philadelphia that engage local communities in developing University-Assisted Community Schools projects in 20 sites across Philadelphia. This program is now expanding to an additional 50 higher education institutions across the country.

"How do we educate students to be creative, contributing democratic citizens in life in a genuine collaborative way?"

— Ira Harkavy

Harkavy concluded by describing the university's national strategy of change — working to create democratic schools. “Teach the teachers and educate the educators,” he noted, “so that teaching and learning occurs by focusing on common, real-world problems in the local communities.”

Eric Schwarz presented his perspective on the challenges and opportunities for service and youth development. Schwarz founded Citizen Schools seven years ago to provide an after-school program that would educate children and strengthen communities. It was targeted at middle school kids, a group that often considers after-school programs to be “for little kids, so they flee.” In fact, only 10% of the youth in organized after-school programs are middle school students or older.

Apprenticeship opportunities form the core of Citizen Schools. These are led by 2000 citizen volunteers — lawyers, business people, architects, chefs, grandmothers — anyone with a skill or trade who is willing to commit to 10 two-hour sessions over ten weeks “to do something amazing with a team of 7 or 8 middle-school kids.” Lawyers work with them to develop a mock trial; architects help them to redesign public spaces; chefs teach them to create gourmet meals for families. The program was even able to find a way for a funeral home operator to participate by involving the youth in developing a set of activities and games to help children deal with grief. Later, the funeral home operator invited Citizen Schools to an international conference in Canada to promote the curriculum. With this rich mix of opportunities, the youth are “sticking with it, they stay,” according to Schwarz, “which is rare for middle-school kids.”

In addition to apprenticeships, the program includes homework support and explorations around the city, including college campuses, as well programming to build writing skills and data analysis skills.

According to Schwarz, while initially the program was led by “typical after-school program staff, which is to say part-time, low wages, no benefits, and high

turnover,” today the program is staffed by teaching fellows in a program designed to turn part-time jobs into full-time jobs by marrying the position with a second part-time job. Through this new model, 35 people have been hired full-time — many of them supported by AmeriCorps. In addition to serving in the after-school program, these teaching fellows work in the morning at a museum or school. As a result, they enter a full-time career track with benefits. The program plans to add a Masters Degree component for the teaching fellows through a partnership with Lesley University.



Eric Schwarz, executive director, Citizen Schools

Schwarz discussed four basic trends addressed by his program: the migration of moms to the workforce; the difficulty of entering onto

“the middle-class track as a worker;” the decline in the social capital; and the narrowing of the purpose of school. He concluded by calling on national service and the after-school field to respond to three specific challenges:

- (1) Transforming the transient low-paid workforce in the after-school field by creating a national professional corps, funded by AmeriCorps.
- (2) Engaging neighborhood-based volunteers to work with youth, and specifically, to introduce them to possible careers.
- (3) Eliminating funding “silos” by providing leadership funds to help build successful models that link after-school programs more powerfully to learning.

Irv Katz appealed to the youth development and service fields to “find a way to be bold about our work.”

Recognizing Challenges: Youth Development and National Service²

- *Fill the ‘Skills Gap’* so that service members graduating from AmeriCorps, but not yet employable, could receive help enabling them to further their

² These challenges and the following strategies were identified by participants in the youth development discussion.

education using the AmeriCorps education award, such as receiving academic credit for their service experience.

- *Make service a key to learning* at every level of schooling and higher education, as well as for the five million ‘dropouts’ in America.
- *Change the role of public schools* to become a tool to promote democratic participation, to provide a broader range of services to meet all the needs of a child, not just educational needs, and to create a continuum from pre-kindergarten through higher education.
- *End the chasm between the educators/in-school and out-of-school/youth-development worlds.*
- *Create better tools to measure how students develop* emotionally and socially, not just academically, and promote a better understanding of the positive outcomes in these areas.
- *Include the voice of youth in policy making.*
- *Engage parents* in education to end distrust between parents and schools.
- *Encourage the perception of youth as service participants rather than recipients.*
- *Develop and retain youth workers*, reversing the shortage of qualified youth workers due to lack of training, resources, and career ladders.
- *Build on the strength of diversity*, which allows for a positive interaction between those who come from the communities served and those with higher education levels from outside the community.
- *Create advocates for sustainable funding for youth programs.*
- *Provide meaningful out-of-school time programs* that include educational enrichment and service-learning, and track outcomes of these enriched programs.



Shirley Sagawa, principal of sagawa/jospin and co-organizer of the forum

Shirley Sagawa recapped the challenges, grouping them into five categories.

- (1) *Service as a form of workforce development* — filling the skill gaps of people leaving AmeriCorps and building pathways to transition national service alumni into the youth development field.
- (2) *Service as a strategy for holistic approaches to youth development*, including strengthening relationships between youth programs and schools, getting parents involved, and educating youth not only academically, but socially and emotionally as well.
- (3) *Building better public understanding* (as well as funder and policymaker appreciation) *of the role of service in youth development.*
- (4) *Strengthening the continuum of service programs* from the youngest age to college, as well as for youth who do not go on to college.
- (5) *Strengthening service programs as a means to encourage citizenship and social change.*

Identifying Strategies: Youth Development and National Service

1) Service as workforce development

National service offers participants an intensive, experiential opportunity to learn about careers in the youth development field. These individuals have already shown their interest and commitment to helping others, and will have a realistic picture of youth work. More effort should be made to help these individuals stay on the path to careers in youth development. Suggested strategies include:

- Creating a national professional corps focused on out-of-school time, possibly modeled on the program Eric Schwarz described.

- Combining the training of teachers, social workers and youth development workers within a community.
- Encouraging the Corporation for National and Community Service to work with the Youth Worker Apprenticeship program at the Department of Labor.
- Weaving together existing national efforts on career ladder, training, vocational education, and other workforce development programs.
- Promoting careers in national service that go beyond two years.

2) Service as a strategy for holistic approaches to youth development

At every level, programs for youth are fragmented, focusing on just one facet of development. Schools do not work with after-school programs; parents are not involved in schools; career development is not integrated into other youth programs. Schools often take a narrow view of their role, focusing only on academic achievement and neglecting social and emotional development. More efforts should be made to promote the holistic development of youth. Suggested strategies include:

- Broadening the goal of education to include building a democratic society, and using service-learning as a way to achieve this goal.
- Providing a link between in-school and out-of-school time by cycling staff through both.
- Engaging citizen volunteers in schools and in out-of-school time programs.
- Developing new metrics for success.
- Using AmeriCorps as a vehicle to bridge the silos of federal funding.
- Developing and disseminating quality curriculum, activities, materials, and supplies for after-school programs.

3) Building better public understanding of service as a strategy for youth development

Limited appreciation for service as a strategy for youth development translates into weak support for

national service among policymakers, funders, and leaders in the youth development field. It results in the underutilization of an effective strategy to serve youth, and a lack of opportunities for youth to serve. Suggested strategies include:

- Working with nontraditional partners such as museums and businesses.
- Engaging national service alumni as advocates.
- Providing support for an organization of AmeriCorps members and alumni.
- Using consistent terminology when discussing national service.
- Marketing service through career offices in high schools and colleges.
- Collecting stories that illustrate the power of national service for youth development.

4) Strengthening the continuum of service programs and educational options for children from the youngest age to college or alternative programs for out-of-school youth.

Service-learning has proven to be an effective strategy to motivate students to achieve academically, including those students who struggle with traditional approaches to teaching. Suggested strategies include:

- Encouraging ‘cross-age’ service-learning where older students (including those who have not excelled academically) tutor younger students.
- Enabling public education dollars to ‘follow the child’ to alternative schools and youth corps.

5) Strengthening service programs to promote citizenship and social change.

Research demonstrates that service does lead to more volunteering and ‘hands-on’ civic action. But there is less evidence that service experiences lead to political activism or advocacy for specific issues or change. Service programs that have had success in encouraging political or policy-oriented forms of civic action include program elements specifically directed at this goal. To

make this practice more widespread, suggested strategies include:

- Encouraging program leaders to model participatory behavior by acting as advocates themselves.
- Incorporating social change curricula into out-of-school time and service programs.
- Requiring service-learning as a part of the educational process and making the requirement meaningful by tying it to important goals such as acquiring a driver's license or graduating from high school.
- Providing information that will help service programs strengthen their reflection components so that "making a larger difference" is explored.
- Advocating for the Corporation for National and Community Service to strengthen the national identity of AmeriCorps through training, joint service days, and other means.
- Researching, identifying and disseminating effective practices to teach youth and other service participants citizen participation skills.



Cal George, special projects director, National Association of Community Health Centers, and **Marty Friedman**, executive director, Education Works, contribute to the discussion

service to get things done.” There are many examples of AmeriCorps members helping to create that infrastructure. The programs provide them with job skills and career opportunities where none previously existed.

In addition, service helps those working in the field to take a “holistic approach to youth development” and to “support a continuum of experiences from kindergarten through high school.” She also noted that “service is a tool for citizenship development” that helps to change the way young people think about themselves and their communities.

Not many people recognize the potential of service to achieve these goals. “It is a serious challenge for us to become marketers and advocates. We have to have a language that is understood by people outside our circle,” according to Milton. She also shared the idea that the Corporation for National Service could help programs “break out of the silos that exist in the federal government” by connecting programs with other sources of government support that would assist their programs to achieve their goals.

Finally, she called for “people in AmeriCorps not to feel isolated but to be aware that they do belong to something bigger than themselves.” Toward this end, she endorsed the idea of creating a “culture of service” in the United States by (1) incorporating service-learning into all school curricula beginning with kindergarten, possibly as a requirement, and (2) creating measures for youth development and citizenship that become as widespread as academic benchmarks.

Follow-up and Reflection on the Youth Group Discussion

Regarding *service as workforce development*, **Catherine Milton** noted that “in those communities where there is a constant poverty, you need an infrastructure of

“It is a serious challenge for us to become marketers and advocates. We have to have a language that is understood by people outside our circle.”

— **Catherine Milton**, executive director, Friends of the Children

Rural Development

AND NATIONAL SERVICE

Sandra Rosenblith questioned the means by which national service can become a more effective strategy for rural development, and asked other practitioners in the field to share their experiences as a way of identifying the problems and challenges inherent in the current system.

Carol Buster described the work of her program. Located in Hugo, Oklahoma, in the southeastern part of the state, the Little Dixie AmeriCorps program offers job training for local residents, while simultaneously providing the local area with a boost in tourism infrastructure. Projects in which Little Dixie AmeriCorps members are engaged include a self-help housing program; landscaping and cabin construction at Hugo Lake; and landscaping, remodeling, and building projects at Beaver's Bend State Park. The key goal of the program is to provide AmeriCorps members with the education and skills training they need to stay and work in their community. The key challenge is finding sufficient funding in a state that is facing large budget deficits and budget cuts.

Mavis Hill discussed the evolution of her community's youth corps program. Tyrell County is a sparsely populated, rural county in the eastern part of North Carolina. Traditional economic development in the county has been difficult for many reasons, including the fact that most of the area is made up of protected wetlands. In the early 1990s, the high school dropout rate was high, and for those young people who did graduate from high school, few had money for college. For the most part, the young people moved away from the county as soon as they could.

During that time, the Tyrell County CDC decided to focus its energies not on traditional CDC activities like



Sandra Rosenblith, senior vice president, Rural LISC

housing, but on the development of human capital. In 1993 it sponsored a small summer youth corps pilot program. In 1994, an AmeriCorps grant allowed the program to double the size of its corps and the scope of its activities. As with the Little Dixie program, members focused on completing environmental projects and building the tourism infrastructure of the community. For example, they built boardwalks and nature trails, helping to create a beautiful and environmentally sensitive tourist attraction. The program

provided its members with job training, team building, and leadership skills so that they could stay in their communities, understand local issues, and become leadership 'assets' for the community. For many youth corps members, the AmeriCorps stipend was the only non-public income for their families. After its initial three-year grant, the Tyrell County youth corps program was denied additional AmeriCorps support. According to Hill, the AmeriCorps model is better designed for programming in urban areas than in rural areas; more administrative and programming flexibility is needed for rural programs.

Jerry Brant described the Pennsylvania region in which his program operates. Entirely rural, the region depended for many years on the mining and steel industries, but slowly the mines and factories closed. Today, the median income for a family of four in this community is \$28,000. NORCAM is a rural CDC that focuses on providing job training and placement for low-income earners and former welfare recipients. It provides affordable housing for first-time homebuyers, low-income seniors and persons with disabilities. NORCAM has an affiliate, Community Financial Resources, which provides micro-credit, small business

loans, and mortgages to local residents.

NORCAM has also been the driving force in the region's efforts to construct a regional trail network using abandoned railroad lines as multi-purpose recreational trails. NORCAM has been able to expand its services and programming, in large measure, because of the support it receives from AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps*VISTA. The major challenge for this program is the difficulty in recruiting people to

serve. The lack of certainty about funding for AmeriCorps has chilled recruitment from within the community. The reality of serving in a truly rural community makes recruitment and retention of members from outside of the community almost impossible.

Allan T. Comp introduced the group to the environmental and social problems caused by acid mine drainage (AMD). It is a "ubiquitous and constant" problem that plagues many states, including much of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. His program model is termed "artful engagement in environmental improvement," which also provides a window into greater community issues. While he has raised over \$1 million from a variety of funders, there are no paid program staff; his only human support comes from AmeriCorps or AmeriCorps*VISTA members, or other interns. For him, the big challenge for service programs is "How do you support success?" Programs need to feel the sense of security that accompanies institutional support. Grant prohibitions on fund-raising are harmful.

Dee Davis perceived that the real challenges facing rural development were connected to telling (or not telling) the stories about service. Very few people know about all of the great accomplishments by rural programs and how successful they are, especially when



T. Allan Comp, Ph.D., founder, AMD & ART;
Jerry Brant, president, The NORCAM Group

considering the challenges they face. He suggested that commissioning external evaluations of programs, something that could then be used by an outside advocacy group, would help spread the good news about the work of rural organizations. Rural community leaders tended to agree with him, and came to a consensus that staff at the Corporation for National Service do not fully appreciate the challenges faced by rural communities in operating

service programs. Leaders of rural communities acknowledged that they have not clearly articulated what national service is doing, and should be doing, to benefit rural areas.

Recognizing Challenges: Rural Development and National Service³

- **Recruitment.** In today's political climate, with the future of AmeriCorps so uncertain, it is difficult to recruit members from the local rural community. The unique nature of rural communities also makes it difficult to recruit and then retain members from outside the community.
- **Costs per member.** It is generally more expensive to operate service programs in rural areas than in urban or suburban areas, due to differences in scale and transportation-related costs. The cost-per-member restrictions may make it prohibitive for rural organizations to operate AmeriCorps programs in the future.
- **Limited terms of service.** Rural problems tend to be long-term, and AmeriCorps members can serve, at

³ These challenges and the following strategies were identified by participants in the rural development discussion.

maximum, only two years. For some programs, it seems that as soon as the AmeriCorps member is trained and truly invested in the success of a project, it is already time for him or her to leave. Most program directors would prefer a longer, perhaps five-year, term of service for AmeriCorps members.

- **Differences between AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps*VISTA.**

There continues to be a strong feeling of inequity between AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps*-VISTA members, and

confusion surrounding the roles of each. It is difficult to keep track of those members who can fundraise, those who can hold part-time jobs, and other stipulations that are specific to each program.

- **Sustainability.** A key question is how programs can continue to raise the required matching funds in rural areas where very little industry or economic development exists, and in states with significant budget shortfalls and budget cuts.
- **Prohibitions against lobbying.** Rules prohibiting the use of federal grant dollars to lobby Congress have made program directors wary of any type of political engagement, including the education of policy makers regarding the value of their programs. As a result, the success of their programs is largely an untold story for the people who could help the most with advocacy for their programs.
- **Focus on volunteer generation.** For the past few years, AmeriCorps programs have been encouraged to make volunteer generation part of their program model. This year, volunteer generation became a required activity of the grant. For many rural programs, volunteer generation is a lofty but very



L to R: Mavis Hill, executive director, Tyrell County Community Development Corporation; Carol Buster, AmeriCorps program director, Little Dixie Community Action Agency; and Deb Jospin, principal, Sagawa/Jospin

difficult goal to achieve.

- **Evaluation.** Program staff are faced with too many overlapping, redundant, and inconsistent performance measures. In the past, information from evaluations were passed on from the local programs to the national level, but no information or feedback ever made its way back to the community. Program directors want to be more engaged in designing relevant evaluation standards, to insure that “more than numbers” are measured and evaluated. As stated

earlier, rural development is a long-term process and AmeriCorps members are short-term resources. Is it more appropriate to measure the program’s long-term progress or, alternatively, what the AmeriCorps members accomplished during their individual terms of service? Many believe that AmeriCorps has been ‘shackled’ by a well-meaning focus on short-term results.

Identifying Strategies: Service as Opportunity in Rural Communities

- **Targeted development goals.** Historically, AmeriCorps*VISTA members have been very successful in helping to build community wealth. In the future, AmeriCorps*VISTA grants could be targeted to specific development ends, including the development of human capital, building community infrastructure (i.e., helping to create after-school and digital divide programs), and the creation of wealth through micro-enterprise development activities.
- **Teacher support.** National service members should be used to support teachers in rural communities, where resources are extremely stretched.

- **Leadership development** is a critical component of successful rural development. By design, service programs support the development of new leaders by engaging young people as “problem solvers, not problems,” and providing them with the tools they need to make a difference in their communities. In some cases, young people have led the way in reinventing entire communities. When they start seeing the difference they can make, they find reasons to stay and participate in their communities. Service programs should become a more significant partner in training the next generation of rural leadership. Possibilities include the creation of a Rural Leadership Academy that would focus on the specific needs of rural communities.
- **Human capital development.** Similar to leadership development is the more general development of human capital. Service programs already play a role here, by providing people with needed skills training and with help to continue their education. Service also provides opportunities for positive youth development, helping to counteract the ‘brain drain’ phenomenon that plagues rural areas. Again, people who have served in their communities are more likely to stay and participate in their communities.
- **Service-based community rebuilding** is a critical component in the survival of rural communities when the private sector market fails, when traditional jobs move away or never existed in the first place. Tyrell County’s youth corps program is a perfect example of this non-traditional path to successful,



Amy Glasmeier, professor of geography and regional planning at Pennsylvania State

environmentally sensitive economic development.

- **Service programs targeted at older Americans** can “capture the energy” of the Baby Boomers, many of whom have decided to retire to rural America. Rather than becoming part of the problem, these retirees can become part of the solution.
- **Creation of incentives.** For both the aging Baby Boomers and other non-traditional service participants, there is support for alternative education awards, including education awards that could be transferred among family members or awards in the form of IDAs or health insurance vouchers.

- **Increasing the number of opportunities for discussion.** Increased communication among experts in the field would allow for the articulation of a coherent theory of change, solutions regarding how best to engage the corporate and small business communities in public/private partnerships, and the creation of an aggressive public engagement campaign.

Follow-up and Reflection on the Rural Group Discussion

Amy Glasmeier spoke about the unique set of challenges that service programs in rural communities face. For example, they tend to be located in remote areas with limited public infrastructure, in organizations with limited internal capacity, and in communities with few organizations involved in complementary service provision — all of which contribute to making rural programs more expensive and less efficient to operate than urban programs.

“We are fighting for recognition, we need to raise public awareness about the wonderful work that is being done in rural communities.”

— Amy Glasmeier

Goals for service programs in rural communities include:

- Create internal capacity, both at the community level and at the organizational level.
- Help people learn how to organize and become effective participants in planning their future.
- Build coalitions and leverage other resources to get things done.
- Build civic capacity and social capital within the community.

Within the world of national service, there are different models of programs, each with its own set of limitations and opportunities. Rural problems challenge each of these models. For service to work as a strategy in rural communities, more flexibility needs to be given to the

programs, allowing them to adapt to the needs of the communities and respond to the problems they are trying to solve.

On the other hand, Glasmeier noted that despite structural challenges, service programs have accomplished a great deal in rural communities. There are countless success stories that go untold; “We are fighting for recognition, we need to raise public awareness about the wonderful work that is being done in rural communities.” Glasmeier noted that the private sector, specifically the larger corporations, need to be engaged “beyond their corporate boundaries” in supporting this work, and that foundations need to think about different ways to engage “the movement” by funding projects that are “new, creative, innovative, and unique.”



Tess Scannell, director, National Senior Corps and **Samuel Halperin**, senior fellow, American Youth Policy Forum

Independent Living for Seniors

AND NATIONAL SERVICE

Tom Endres began by discussing long-term care (LTC) in the context of independent living for seniors. Describing the need for long-term care as an “emerging national crisis,” Endres stated that all Americans are “at risk” of needing long-term and personal care services. This is due, in large part, to the changing demographics of age in this country and to the fact that more people suffer from chronic illness for longer periods of time.

In addition, LTC services are also increasing in the under-65 age populations due to escalating childhood illnesses. Few people are prepared for the financial risk and personal demands involved in providing LTC to family members. First, long-term care insurance is not part of our culture, and its cost is prohibitively high. Second, the backbone of long-term care is family and friends; they provide 80% of such services. As a result, society does not consider care giving to be a real job. The reality is exhausting and thankless work that puts a tremendous strain on families. Moreover, families are now geographically dispersed and adult children are a diminishing resource as providers of LTC services. Third, if the informal LTC system collapses, the cost of a formal system would break the bank. The actual costs in Medicare and Medicaid will skyrocket. Fourth, the long-term care system is fragmented and complex. People often do not know where to go for help.



Tom Endres, Endres and Associates;
John Pribyl, Senior Companion director,
Lutheran Social Services of Minnesota

John Pribyl noted that while there are several ways to think about this issue, “the bottom line is that nobody wants to go to a nursing home; people want to stay in their homes as long as possible.” Using the services of stipended volunteers is the most “efficient, cost effective, and humane way” to provide support to frail seniors and help them remain at home. “When one thinks about what friends do for friends, it’s basic.” He recounted the story of his great aunt

Agnes. She lived alone, and he came to see her once a week, bringing her groceries and generally keeping in touch. He was, in a sense, her ‘junior companion.’ When he could not make his weekly visit, however, she would become upset. She would feel sorry for herself, making herself feel worse until she had to go and see her doctor. But in truth, she did not need to see her doctor. Her doctor simply became her ‘very expensive senior companion,’ a source for social interaction, someone she had come to trust over the years. The actual Senior Companion program is a cost-efficient and effective alternative that helps seniors meet their needs for social interaction, and helps provide them with services that make their stays at home possible.

Adriane LaRoza noted that what young people can contribute to these senior issues is “staggering.” She then told the story of Laura Lockwood, a teenager serving in ManaTEEN, who started a program designed

“The opportunity to have this conversation has happened before, but not a lot has changed; this is a forum where we should take this chance to make some changes happen.”

— Dwight Rasmussen

to prepare other young people to “be patient with” the seniors they visited. The young people were also trained to assess the home safety needs of the seniors, and now they are participating in an ‘Adopt a Grandparent’ program. Youth can be the catalyst for getting families more involved in the independent living issue. ManaTEEN uses all of the national service resources available, including AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps*VISTA, which allows everyone to contribute “what he or she does best.”

Carol Crecy stated that volunteers — over 500,000 of them in programs such as Senior Companions — are the backbone of what happens at the community level. The Network of State Units on Aging and local Area Agencies on Aging rely on volunteers to assist in the planning, coordination, and delivery of services.

Tom Endres reflected on the last thirty years of national service. In the 1970s and 1980s, volunteers proved that they would “give graciously.” Systems and programs were designed and established with an emphasis on the volunteer side of the volunteer-service equation. In the 1990s, the emphasis changed and focus was placed on determining what difference volunteers make. Volunteers began to be evaluated in terms of outcomes and impacts on the community. Volunteers now stand as a credible, expanding resource to help support long-term personal care and independent living for seniors.

Questions to Consider

What’s the future for national service and independent living for seniors?

For national service to be truly relevant and responsive to the needs of seniors, it needs to attract a ‘new breed’ of volunteers. One suggestion for increasing involvement is the idea of building ‘family teams’ of volunteers. This model helps to address the sustainability issue



Adraine LaRoza, executive director, ManaTEEN and **Carol Crecy**, director, Center for Communication and Consumer Services, Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

and allows people to fill in for one another. According to **Earl Shelp**, the team is the surrogate or extended family, out of which grows a significant degree of cooperation.

“We need to make national service sexy” is a common refrain among practitioners in the service field. While some people will volunteer no matter what, a creative social marketing campaign may be needed to recruit others (the newer volunteers). Senior experts are vocal in their conviction: “Don’t underestimate the kids!”

The need to support service programs in which volunteering options vary is tantamount, thereby providing opportunities for younger and/or episodic volunteers to participate. Programs may also consider using volunteers who do not depend on stipends.

Labor unions would also be a good source of volunteers. In any case, the unions need to be involved in issues of expansion and to avoid potential conflicts in the public policy arena. Union leaders are sometimes

wary of engaging with volunteer organizations because it is often thought that the use of volunteers is a way to reduce the paid workforce.

More venues in the spirit of the forum, in which seniors and youth come together to discuss these issues, are necessary. The funding community is key — if funders begin to employ an intergenerational lens in their decisions, they will see the value of this partnership and will help bring the groups together.

Donna Rabiner highlighted the evaluation of the Senior Companions Program conducted by the Research Triangle Institute for the Corporation for National Service. Her conclusion was that the Senior Companions Program provides a viable model for service. Funding for the program should be expanded, and income eligibility requirements relaxed so that more people can serve.

Donna Rabiner, Ph.D, Health and Aging Program, Research Triangle Institute International

Tess Scannell remarked that the purpose of this conference was to “set the stage for reauthorization [of national service legislation], to make the case that national service really works to serve serious human and social needs throughout the country.” She stressed that Americans need to see facts that support the claim that “service works,” that programs can use volunteers of all ages to help ease the independent living crisis.

Where do we want to be in three to five years?

Endres remarked that as the problems of long-term care and independent living escalate, policymakers are going to have to look at low-cost or no-cost alternatives to hospital and nursing home care. National service is an alternative.

Jaia Peterson noted, “We need to get to a point where people realize that it is vital to fund national service.”

Scannell cautioned service programs not to position themselves as low-cost alternatives to purchased services provided by unionized workers. Rather, volunteer service should be offered as a product that no one else is providing. Under this scenario, unions and private sector providers will see service programs as helpful complements to what they do, not as rivals or threats and not as an excuse to displace paid workers. Service programs must be able to distinguish themselves in the marketplace.

Goals to be targeted include:

Recruiting and training enough of the right volunteers to help meet the needs posed by seniors living independently. Much of the group’s discussion revolved around whether this goal was achievable. When looking at why people volunteer, for example, flexibility is mentioned as a key incentive.

Developing the capacity of long-term service care providers to manage their programs. Volunteer networks can be used as the major complementary resource to paid



Earl Shelp, Ph.D., president, and **Ronald Sunderland,** Interfaith Care Partners in Houston

caregivers or family caregivers, freeing up health care professionals so they can use those skills in which they are specifically trained.

Steve Ristau articulated his vision of this goal as a three-legged stool, under which the following questions were asked:

- (1) Do you have interested people?
- (2) Is the program infrastructure flexible enough to deal with them?
- (3) Do the public policy and funding environments support this flexible model?

All three questions need to be answered ‘yes’ for this goal to be met.

What’s in it for the Hill?

The field needs to prove to Congress that it has programs, and that these low-cost programs can deliver a full menu of important services. The point also needs to be made that volunteer service strengthens families and thus strengthens communities. Furthermore, 60% of Medicaid dollars go to nursing homes. In trying to control Medicaid spending, the federal government needs to consider the value of senior service programs as a partner in this effort.

Recognizing Challenges: Independent Living for Seniors and National Service⁴

- *Communicating and coordinating resources in communities.* For example, many senior service providers function independently from one another. People must approach one provider for one thing, and another provider for something else. The community needs efficient and effective linkages among providers, making it easier for a family to go one place to get what they need.

⁴ These challenges and the following strategies were identified by participants in the rural development discussion.

- *Committing time.* Potential volunteers often want to do ‘one-stop-shopping’ when seeking volunteer placements. The programs must learn to accommodate volunteers who want to help but cannot make a long-term commitment such as that required of Senior Companions.
- *Engaging young people.* To do this, the national service community needs to remove ‘categorical program definitions,’ become more flexible, and promote greater integration at all levels of programming. The Corporation for National Service promotes more cross-stream programming but the question is “how effective has cross-stream programming been?”
- *Telling the story of these great programs.* Many experts in the field consider the Senior Companions Program to be the ‘best kept secret’ of national service. The challenge is to get the positive messages out, and acquire more funding for the programs as a result, but without making the demand for programs greater than the current capacity (the ‘waiting list’ problem).
- *Spending inordinate amounts of time on paperwork.*
- *Transporting clients.* If the program is in an urban area, volunteers are reluctant to fight traffic to get clients to their doctors’ appointments. If the program is in a rural area, volunteers often cannot reach their clients. Programs need more funding simply to reimburse volunteers for transporting clients.
- *Matching needs with services.* For example, seniors need assistance with activities of daily living (ADLs), including help with daily baths and dressing, but volunteers would rather provide

lighter chores such as grocery shopping.

- *Convincing the government that volunteering costs money and needs an infrastructure to be effective.* For example, funds spent to hire volunteer coordinators are a very smart investment because the coordinators leverage additional volunteers and facilitate these volunteers’ experiences. Organizations need funding to support their administrative work, but funders are often reluctant to provide for those expenses.
- *Bringing the business community into this issue area.* One idea is to have an award program for companies that support volunteer initiatives, including paid time off for employees to do volunteer work.
- *Legal liability issues* inherent in programs that bring people, often strangers, into the homes of senior citizens, or that work with vulnerable populations.
- *Maintaining standards and qualifications for volunteers.* In order to recruit consistently high quality volunteers, programs may have to offer incentives in addition to a small stipend.
- *Supporting a nonprofit organization’s desire and ability to be innovative and successful.* More training and technical assistance will help the nonprofits manage

budget cuts, fundraise and build awareness for their programs. “It’s going to require risk-taking leaders of nonprofits” to succeed in this new world.

- *Reaching out to immigrant communities.*
- *Research is needed to show that volunteers actually are successful at keeping people out of nursing homes.*



L to R: Peter Edelman, professor of law, Georgetown University; Susan Stroud; Ira Harkavy; and Catherine Milton

Identifying Strategies: Independent Living for Seniors and National Service



Independent Living Discussion Group

- *Design a public relations campaign* that highlights both the current crisis in independent living and all of the research showing that volunteerism works in this area. It may be useful to have a celebrity spokesperson. It may also help to refer to the issue as “independent and respite services” or “independent and family caregiver support” rather than ‘long-term care.’
- *Make the ‘business case’* for why this is a critical issue and how value is added through volunteer service.
- *Develop bold new partnerships* with AARP, NCOA and other national groups working to support seniors, and the faith community.
- *Build families as a vocal advocacy group.*
- *Tap youth as a resource.*
- *Encourage the Senate to conduct more hearings on ‘the graying of America.’* In addition, identify a Congressional champion to fight for these issues, someone who has experienced these caregiving issues personally.
- *Work on changes to the legislation* reauthorizing the Corporation for National Service, adding flexibility where it is needed.
- *Continue to network and create partnerships* with other service groups at the state and local level, connecting caregiver systems to volunteer resource systems.

John Gomperts, executive director,
Experience Corps

Follow-up and Reflection on the Independent Living Group Discussion

John Gomperts gave an overview of the prior discussions around national service and independent living and summarized the key points. In terms of

long-term care, the goal now is to figure out how national service can fit into that work. Long-term care is still considered a private, family problem, not a public problem. Public support needs to be ‘sold’ to people. The service community has to tell the story about how ‘service as a strategy’ can have a tremendous, beneficial

impact on social problems. Successful models need to be identified and replicated. Flexibility and consistency must be built into both service program models and delivery systems.

The key points to keep in mind during these important discussions are:

- Long-term care is an impending crisis with the potential to bankrupt families and the federal systems of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security — systems upon which most people continue to rely for economic security in later life.
- The risk of the need for long-term care is not just to the aged. Everyone is at risk and the fastest growing users of long-term care are those under 65. Increasing diagnosis of child asthma and attention deficit disorder is suddenly a new type of sandwiching in which adult children who are attempting to care for their own parents are also contending with care issues for their children.
- Service is not recognized or accepted as the tool it has become. Service participants, from youth to older adults, have become a new supply of human resources to a service sector that continues to be overwhelmed with increasing needs in an environment of diminishing resources.

The recommendations from these independent living discussions are the beginning of a blueprint to define service as a strategy to help avert a long-term care catastrophe. The service community and the informal care giving community must be brought into the discussion about the future of long-term care and how to pay for it.

The Way Forward

The power of a convening an event such as this Forum is the chance to explore new visions for the future. In the Forum, speakers and participants offered compelling — although not entirely consistent — ideas of ways that national service could transform America for the better.

Legislative Perspectives on the Future of National Service

Rep. Rosa DeLauro reflected on what she termed an ‘old-fashioned’ notion of serving one’s country, describing service as not merely a high calling, but an obligation. She recalled growing up in a household with immigrant parents, where she was “constantly reminded of the value of giving back to a country that had given so much to us. My father, who dropped out of school in the seventh grade, largely because students made fun of



Representative Rosa DeLauro (CT-3rd)

his broken English, went on to become a proud veteran of this country. He served his country and got on the city council. My mother served on the city council, too, for over 35 years. Looking back, I understand how I myself ended up in public service — and, indeed, how so many children of immigrant parents ended up serving this country over the centuries.”

DeLauro cautioned that this sense of shared responsibility “has sadly dissipated over the course of the last several years.” However, the tragedy of September 11 has inspired “a

new wave of efforts to fortify our communities and bolster enrollment in successful volunteer programs such as AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America and Senior Corps.” In response to this revitalized enthusiasm, she proposed a new effort focusing on the teenage years, a time when new experiences and choices influence future decisions.

Summer of Service: A New Rite of Passage?

Several Forum speakers called for new ways for young teenagers to serve their communities, particularly during out of school time.

In proposing legislation to create a new ‘summer of service’ program for young teens, Rep. Rosa DeLauro noted that “the teenage years are a critical time in the lives of young people, a time when new experiences and choices influence the rest of their lives. How they spend that time can either put them on a course of engaged learning and active citizenship or send them spiraling down a path of risky behavior and the likelihood of failure. But there is no question that when properly organized, supervised, and trained, teenagers make invaluable contributions to their communities.”

Rep. DeLauro called for a network of service programs for middle school students to serve in their communities after school or during the summer. These programs would be staffed with current AmeriCorps members or university students — who have already proven themselves to be strong, positive role models for youth. She believes that a national AmeriCorps-staffed effort would not only prove cost effective, but also enable the programs to benefit both from the large network of community-based AmeriCorps sponsors and the core organizational capacity of the program.

Rep. DeLauro announced that she was reintroducing her bill, **Rite of Passage Service Act**, which would apply to students between the ages of 12 and 16. Like AmeriCorps, after completing 150 of hours of service, participants in a Rite of Passage Service Program would be eligible for a \$500 stipend to help pay for college. In order to link service activities to school curricula, each program would have the option to develop a service-learning curriculum linked to academic goals. Participants would also have the opportunity to attend workshops focused on leadership skills, public speaking, and conflict resolution as well as other development programs.

“I am hopeful that we can make national service a rite of passage for *every* teenager in America as they advance through school,” she concluded.

President Bush: A Call to Service

John Bridgeland found his vision for the future in America’s long-standing civic tradition — encompassing military personnel, fire fighters and police officers, Peace Corps volunteers, and citizen volunteers. He described President Bush’s efforts to expand the Peace Corps, Senior Corps, AmeriCorps, and other initiatives that make up the USA Freedom Corps. “[Civic participation] is not just waiting for potential terrorist

attacks — it’s emergencies such as tornado warnings and volunteers responding to those needs,” noted Bridgeland. It is the “increase in the neighborhood watch programs, training people who can respond to emergencies.” He cautioned against an entirely nationalized service in this country, which he believes could inhibit the spirit of volunteerism.

For more information on the **Rite of Passage Service Act**, please go to <http://www.house.gov/delauro/legislation.html>

“The culture of service is very important no matter whether you participate in a government-sponsored or locally sponsored program. After 9/11 people are coming to the realization that they do not need to be asked to serve,” Bridgeland concluded. “Service is fundamental to what it means to be an American.”

“A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum”: Ten Years of National Service

Les Lenkowsky discussed the challenges facing the Corporation for National Service and reforms

underway to “stay ahead of the storm.” He described the Corporation’s emphasis on performance measurement and the impressive outcomes obtained over the last decade, including improving the “health of seniors, the educational attainment of young people, the independence of folks on welfare or people who are disabled.” He also noted that the Corporation has made major changes in its financial and personnel systems, as well as reengineering the grant-making process to simplify the handling of grants, to improve the ability to

review and monitor programs, and to provide more training and technical assistance to grantees.

Lenkowsky stressed that the agency still has far to go. “We were conceived during the Bush 1 administration, born and developed through infancy during the Clinton administration, and now here in the Bush 2



John Bridgeland, director, USA Freedom Corps

administration, guess where we are? We are adolescents,” he concluded. “We have growing pains...and some parts have grown better than others.”

In addition to answering questions about political support for AmeriCorps and how future funds would be allocated, Lenkowsky responded to a question about the future of Learn and Serve America. His theory about why the program has not been significantly increased is because of its focus on “pedagogical service learning.” The problem is “it’s hard to get other people excited about pedagogy.” For this reason, he has tried to emphasize the program’s role in developing citizenship. “If people start thinking about Learn and Serve America as a program that builds the habits of citizenship in young people, we’ll gather more support,” he suggested.

Plenary Session: Expanding the Impact of National Service

A lively panel revealed strong views by engaging a



Dorothy Stoneman, president, YouthBuild USA;
Sarah Brown, executive director, National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy

diverse group of experts on the utility and future of national service.

Moderator **Juan Williams**, National Public Radio senior correspondent, challenged participants to explain what does not work in national service.

Francisco Guajardo, founder and executive director of the Llano Grande Community Center, recalled efforts

to obtain AmeriCorps*VISTAs to help with his school-based youth center on the Texas border. He wanted more volunteers and more flexibility than the AmeriCorps*VISTA program could offer, and as a result, the Center created its own program.

James Firman, president and CEO of the National Council on the Aging, expressed similar frustration with national service, calling for more flexibility in Senior Corps programs and for greater inclusion of seniors in AmeriCorps.

Offering a contrasting opinion, **Reverend Wilson Goode, Sr.**, executive director of the Amachi Program and former mayor of Philadelphia, said he had found

*The **Amachi** program, run by Public/Private Ventures with AmeriCorps funding through the Mid-Atlantic Network of Youth and Family Services, uses AmeriCorps members placed with churches to recruit mentors for children of imprisoned parents.*

The outcomes resulting from mentor-child relationships have been very promising; pairings that lasted for more than one year (62% did) have impacted these children in many ways. They have begun to feel more confident about doing their school work, skipped fewer days of school, received higher grades, and were less likely to start using drugs and/or alcohol.

Please see <http://www.ppv.org/content/reports/amachi.html> for more information.

AmeriCorps to be flexible and an extremely valuable resource. The Amachi program uses AmeriCorps members to recruit and supervise volunteer mentors from local churches. The mentors work with children of prisoners.

Sarah Brown, executive director of the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, contended that national service is not well understood

by organizations that are not part of the service field. For example, although several service-learning models are very effective at reducing teen pregnancy, organizations in her field are generally not aware of that fact. She argued that support for service would be more widespread if efforts were made to build partnerships outside of the service field.

Dorothy Stoneman, president of YouthBuild USA, described how her program is the result of the linkage of service, job training, and education. While she had suggestions to make AmeriCorps better fit the YouthBuild model — such as changing the structure of the living allowance — she felt advocacy would be better directed at seeking more resources, not changing regulations.

Mil Duncan, director of Community and Resource Development at the Ford Foundation and author of *Worlds Apart: Why Poverty Persists in Rural America*, suggested that AmeriCorps plays an important role in building the infrastructure that enables small community-based organizations to mobilize volunteers.



Mil Duncan, Community and Resource Development director, the Ford Foundation, and **James Firman**, president and CEO, the National Council on the Aging

Juan Williams asked the panelists to comment on whether additional funds for national service are really necessary, and the correspondence to the utilization of current resources.

Jim Firman responded by questioning the purpose of national service — to be a resource to communities or to produce results independently? He contended that it is “more important for service programs to support and supplement

existing community infrastructures” rather than to create new service initiatives. Expanding and improving existing programs will bring new energy to the movement — when service programs are seen as an essential resource, community advocacy and grassroots support are able to leverage funding that new programs cannot access.

Rev. Goode began by recalling his first experience with national service at a local school, which closed every day at 3 pm; there were no evening programs. Because of AmeriCorps, the school could be kept open evenings and weekends, an important priority for the community. The Amachi

program reached out to AmeriCorps for help and found it was able to engage 20 volunteers at each church as a result. “There are a lot of problems that national service cannot solve,” he noted, “but there are some it can, and we need to allocate resources for it.”

Laura Lockwood, the founder of ManaTEEN and an AmeriCorps member, spoke of the tremendous interest in service among teens. The ManaTEEN club engages 12,000 teens; it received 400 applications for a handful

Service Learning and Teen Pregnancy

The Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy publication *Emerging Answers: Research Findings on Programs to Reduce Teen Pregnancy*, by Douglas Kirby, Ph.D., includes two service-learning models on its short list of programs that work to prevent teen pregnancy.

of AmeriCorps positions. While the different parts of AmeriCorps (VISTA, State and National, NCCC) can be confusing to community organizations because the AmeriCorps members in each program have different restrictions on their roles, she believes that the demand is there on the part of those who want to serve as well as from community organizations who want AmeriCorps members to work with them.

Juan Williams then asked who defines what national service can accomplish: “In order for national service to be successful, it should be as flexible as possible, and meet the needs that exist in communities, right?”

Mil Duncan responded that “Service is an investment in the power of individuals. . . . They are a resource for people ‘on the ground.’” **Francisco Guajardo** agreed. The purpose of national service should not be “to meet our needs, but to begin building on the assets of people who are there.” Several panelists agreed that the most important attribute of national service is its capacity to help local organizations carry out their missions.

Other Forum participants had strong views about the role of national service. **Carol Kuhre**, executive director of Rural Action, reminded the group that national service came to her community when the local people had created a strategy and sought help implementing it. “Appalachians don’t want to be ‘saved’

for the sixth time,” she noted. Instead, she worked with hundreds of people in Appalachia over a two-year period to identify their assets, develop a strategy, and obtain AmeriCorps*VISTA positions so they could place local people to perform the service.

Rev. Goode agreed. “The community itself decides what it wants. In fact, all 42 Amachi AmeriCorps Members are from the local congregations they are serving.”

Gene Sofer, partner in the Susquehanna Group, spoke from the audience, reminding the group that the AmeriCorps statute has 14 program models and allows applicants to create their own models if none of those listed fit. He also noted that even national AmeriCorps programs are invited into communities, not “parachuted in.”

Sister Katherine Corr, executive director of the Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program, concurred. “Our program was just six mission volunteers before AmeriCorps,” she noted. “Now we’re 330” reaching 80,000 children.

Forum participants **Michael Tierney** and **Rachel Tompkins** spoke from the floor about the role of national service in rural areas. While Tierney raised the need to “tweak” the program to broaden its purposes,



Laura Lockwood, founder, ManaTEEN, and **Francisco Guajardo**, founder and executive director, Llano Grande Community Center



Reverend Wilson Goode, Sr., executive director, the Amachi Program, and **Juan Williams**, National Public Radio senior correspondent

he also said he thought it was hard for local people to affect policy. Tompkins cautioned that AmeriCorps “is always under attack for its survival,” and that the program is especially important to places that have scarce resources, such as rural communities.

Juan Williams invited panelists to make concluding comments. **Laura Lockwood** stressed that “AmeriCorps has given me the training and experience that I wouldn’t have had the chance to get,” which would help her develop grassroots projects. **Francisco Guajardo** called national service “absolutely essential” and deserving of greater investment. He challenged President Bush to match his “big talk” with resources.

Dorothy Stoneman concurred that even in the current fiscal environment, advocates should not be timid about seeking increased resources for service. She endorsed the concept of an eighth-grade service corps that had been discussed by Rep. Rosa DeLauro, and called for a dramatic increase in youth corps. Conservation corps

were started “for boys in the woods,” she quipped. “I’m for boys and girls in the hoods and woods.”

Sarah Brown, as an advocate for teen pregnancy prevention programs, noted that groups such as hers “need your service, while service programs such as AmeriCorps need our advocacy.” Mil Duncan agreed that creating service opportunities requires resources, and that as a nation we should invest in our future in this way.

Jim Firman argued that the nation’s greatest untapped resource is the time and talent of older people. “They vote,” he noted, “and could broaden the constituency” for national service.

Rev. Goode concluded by cautioning the audience about criticizing service. After 40 years in public service he has “learned if we start to pick at the edges, people will abolish the program.” He concluded, “We can’t afford to have any resources taken away.

Funding Perspectives on the Future of National Service

Susan Berresford, president of the Ford Foundation, closed the Forum with comments on the future of national service from a funder's perspective. She thanked Susan Stroud for organizing an important conversation about service as a vehicle for mobilizing people to address important social issues. The Ford Foundation has been a funder in the service field for many decades in the US and in other countries. The Foundation's support grows from a belief that service programs help people to develop civic awareness of the complexities of public issues, an understanding of social change, and provide the structure to support people to engage with important issues. Service programs can also help to create a sense of solidarity across lines of faith, income and ethnicity.

She articulated three roles for private funders in national service: (1) supporting innovation; (2) supporting "research about the effectiveness of the models that exist" and sharing it with practitioners around the world; and (3) convening "practitioners with policy makers for a possible dialogue, like this one, finding ways for advocacy, marketing and development of new ideas" in the US and around the world.

She also proposed a list of the things that need to be done:

- *Develop a clear vision about scale.* "If all our policy wishes came true, what is the scale we really want?"
- *Connect vision with context,* particularly in a policy climate of devolution of responsibility to states and a context of fiscal scarcity for the foreseeable future.
- *'Nail down' participant results.* "For example, we need to be able to say more about the way service by

young people helps develop their maturity and sense of purposefulness and efficacy. We need to say more about the ways people who participate in service become more knowledgeable about social issues and see connections between realities on the ground and policy. We need to be able to say more about how these experiences contribute to successful careers. And we need to say more about how these programs solve important problems or help to avoid problems developing."



Susan Berresford, president, the Ford Foundation

- *Share the US experience* — particularly strategy, program design, and political organization — with an international network or practitioners and policy-makers.
- *Engage in a discussion of 'public morality'.* Over the course of the last few decades "we have become more preoccupied with private morality than public morality. Making responsible choices about one's life is important, but we cannot address large problems facing society one person at a time. For instance, we need a discussion about the decisions that public officials make regarding the use of public resources — whether

they are used to provide genuine opportunities for people who don't have opportunities, whether they build on the strength of communities that are there, whether they protect those who can't protect themselves."

Berresford concluded by reflecting on the role of service in this question of public morality — its role in mobilizing "people in their communities to work hard and to try to make things better for people who suffer in this country. I think national service has a role in rejuvenating a sense of public morality. And there needs to be a big public investment in service for us to realize the potential of service in mobilizing communities and promoting a sense of public morality."



APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Participants Directory

Jorina Ahmed

Director
Corporation's State Director - PA
Robert Nic Nix Federal Building
900 Market Street, Suite 229
PO Box 04121
Philadelphia, PA 19107
P: (215) 597-2834
F: (215) 597-2807
jahmed@cns.gov
www.nationalservice.org

Suzanne Aisenberg

Program Officer
Atlantic Philanthropic Services
125 Park Avenue, 21st Floor
New York, NY 10017-5581
P: (212) 916-7300
F: (212) 916-7321
sga@apscompany.com

Susan Anderson

Project Coordinator
National Association of Area Agencies
on Aging (n4a)
927 15th St., N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 296-8130
F: (202) 296-8134
sanders660@aol.com
www.n4a.org

Ellynnne Bannon

Education Associate
Education and Workforce Committee,
Representative Miller
1107 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515
P: (202) 226-2068
F: (202) 225-3614
Ellynnne.bannon@mail.house.gov
edworkforce.house.gov

Carlos Benitez

Data & Communications Coordinator
Center for Social Development
Box 1196
One Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130
P: (314) 935-4226
cab2@gwbmail.wustl.edu
gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd

Susan Berresford

President
Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017
P: (212) 573-5000
www.fordfound.org

Jill Blair

Principal
BTW Consultants
2550 9th Street, Suite 113
Berkeley, CA 94710
P: (510) 665-6100
F: (510) 665-6129
jblair@informingchange.com
www.informingchange.com

Jerry Brant

President
The NORCAM Group
4200 Crawford Avenue
Northern Cambria, PA 15714
P: (814) 948-4444
F: (814) 948-4449
ncampres@surfshop.net
www.ruralisc.org/norcam.htm

John Bridgeland

Director
USA Freedom Corps
USA Freedom Corps
736 Jackson Place
Washington, DC 20503
P: (202) 456-7381
F: (202) 456-9720
www.usafreedomcorps.gov

Nelda Brown

Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001-1431
P: (202) 336-7031
neldab@ccsso.org
www.ccsso.org

Samantha Brown

Heads Up: A University Neighborhood
Initiative
645 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20003
P: (202) 544-4468, x24
F: (202) 544-4437
www.headsup-dc.org

Sarah Brown

Executive Director
National Campaign to Fight Teen
Pregnancy
1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 478-8500
F: (202) 478-8588
sbrown@teenpregnancy.org
www.teenpregnancy.org

Lynn Brown-Zounes

President
National Association of Senior
Companion Project Directors
Community Teamwork Inc.
167 Dutton Street
Lowell, MA 01852
P: (978) 459-0551
F: (978) 970-1483
lbrown@comteam.org
www.comteam.org

Marla I. Bush

International Coordinator
Administration on Aging
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
200 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20201
P: (202) 357-3508
F: (202) 357-3560
marla.bush@aoa.gov
www.aoa.gov

Carol Buster

AmeriCorps Program Director
Little Dixie Community Action Agency
502 West Duke
Hugo, OK 74743
P: (580)326-5201
F: (580) 326-2305
cbuster@ldcaa.org
www.littledixie.org

Barbara Canyes

Director
Massachusetts Campus Compact
Tufts University
196 Boston Avenue, Suite 2400
Medford, MA 02155
P: (617) 627-3889
F: (617) 627-3837
barbara.canyes@tufts.edu
www.compact.org

Toby Chalberg

Manager for National Service
City Cares
1605 Peachtree Str.
Atlanta, GA 30309
P: (404) 879-2755
F: (404) 253-1020
tchalberg@citycares.org
www.citycares.org

Elizabeth Clemzmer

AARP
601 E. Street NW
Washington, DC 20049
P: (202) 434-3860
EClemmer@aarp.org
www.aarp.org

Barbara Clinton

Director, Center for Health Services
Vanderbilt University
Center for Health Services
Vanderbilt University
2201 West End Avenue
Nashville, Tennessee 37235
barbara.m.clinton@vanderbilt.edu
www.mc.vanderbilt.edu

Cathleen (Kate) Clinton

Director of Major Gifts
American Red Cross, National
Headquarters
430 17th Street, NW
Garden Level
Washington, DC 20006
P: (202) 434-4047
F: (202) 434-4999
cathleen.clinton@verizon.net
www.redcross.org

Hillary Rodham Clinton

United States Senator (NY)
476 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-4451
(202) 228-0282
clinton.senate.gov

Camy Clough

Smithsonian Museum of American
History
P: (202) 357-2833
F: (202) 357-1853
csclough@comcast.net
americanhistory.si.edu

Amy Cohen

Director, Learn and Serve America
Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
P: (202) 606-5000, (ext. 484)
F: (202) 565-2787
acohen@cns.gov
www.learnandserve.org

T. Allan Comp, Ph.D.

Founder, AMD & ART
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation
and Enforcement
South Interior Building
1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20240
P: (202) 208-2836
tcomp@osmre.gov
www.amdandart.org

AnnMaura Connolly

Vice President & Chief of Staff
City Year
5440 31st Street, NW
Washington, DC
P: (202) 776-7780
F: (202) 776-7788
aconnolly@cityyear.org
www.cityyear.org

Cheryl L. Cook

Director
National Assembly of Health and
Human Organizations – Family
Strengthening Policy Center
1319 F Street, NW, Suite 601
Washington, DC 20004
P: (202) 347-2080 (ext. 17)
F: (202) 393-4517
ccook@nassembly.org
www.nassembly.org/nassembly

Sister Katherine “Sissy” Corr

Executive Director
 Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program
 – AmeriCorps
 403 Markland Ave.
 Baltimore, MD 21212
 P: (410) 532-6864 (ext.14)
 F: (410) 532-2418
 scorr@ndmva.org
 www.ndmva.org

Carol Crecy

Director
 Center for Communication and
 Consumer Services,
 Administration on Aging
 Washington, DC 20201
 P: (202) 619-0724
 Carol.Crecy@aoa.gov
 www.aoa.gov

Beth Curry

Senior Director of Programming for
 Older Persons
 Lutheran Social Services
 29385 Rancho California Road
 Temecula, CA 92591
 P: (909) 691-1641
 F: (909) 691-1642
 lss-scp@ix.netcom.com
 www.lssmn.org

Dee Davis

President
 Rural Strategies
 46 East Main Street
 Whitesburg, KY 41858
 P: (606) 632-3244
 F: (606) 632-3243
 dee@ruralstrategies.org
 www.ruralstrategies.org

Rosa DeLauro

United States Representative
 (Connecticut – 3rd)
 Washington, DC Office
 2262 Rayburn House Office Building
 Washington, DC 20515
 P: 202-225-3661
 F: 202-225-4890
 www.house.gov/delauro

Adrienne Dern

Deputy Director
 National Association of Area Agencies
 on Aging (n4a)
 927 15th St, N.W., 6th Floor
 Washington, DC 20005
 P: (202) 296-8130
 F: (202) 296-8134
 adern@n4a.org
 www.n4a.org

Andres Dominguez

Senior Program Officer
 Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
 4801 Rockhill Road
 Kansas City, MO 64110-2046
 P: (816) 932-1161
 F: (816) 932-1420
 adomingu@emkf.org
 www.emkf.org

Kayla Meltzer Drogosz

Governance Studies Program
 The Brookings Institution
 1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
 Washington, DC 20036-2188
 P: (202) 797-6407
 F: (202) 797-2964
 kdrogosz@brookings.edu
 www.brookings.edu/gs/gs_hp.htm

Cynthia Mildred Duncan

Director, Community and Resource
 Development
 Ford Foundation/ Asset Building and
 Community Development
 320 East 43rd Street
 New York, NY 10017
 P: (212) 573-4615
 m.duncan@fordfound.org
 www.fordfound.org/program/
 community.cfm

Peter Edelman

Professor of Law
 Georgetown University Law Center
 600 New Jersey Ave., NW
 Washington, DC 20001
 P: (202) 662-9074
 F: (202) 662-9412
 edelman@law.georgetown.edu
 law.georgetown.edu

Tom Endres

Endres and Associates
 11400 Luxmanor Road
 Rockville, MD 02852
 P: (301) 881-2599
 teendres@aol.com

Carol Farquhar

Executive Director
 Grantmakers in Aging
 7333 Paragon Road, Suite 220
 Dayton, OH 45459
 P: (937) 435-3156
 F: (937) 435-3733
 cfarquhar@giaging.org
 www.giaging.org

James Firman

President and CEO
 The National Council on the Aging
 300 D Street, S.W., #801
 Washington, DC 20024
 P: (202) 479-6601
 F: (202) 479-0735
 james.firman@ncoa.org
 www.ncoa.org

Rita Foy-Moss

Education Program Specialist
 US Department of Education, Office of
 Safe and Drug Free Schools
 555 New Jersey Ave. NW
 Room 513c
 Washington, DC 20208-5573
 P: (202) 219-2027
 F: (202) 219-2135
 Rita.Foy@ed.gov
 www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS

Martin Friedman

Executive Director
 Education Works
 684 Whitehead Road
 Lawrenceville, NJ
 08648
 P: (609) 392-6662
 F: (609) 392-6211
 mfriedman@educationworks-online.org
 www.educationworks-online.org

Calvin George

Special Projects Director
National Association of Community
Health Centers
7200 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 210
Bethesda, MD 20814
P: (301) 347-0400 ext. 2069
F: (301) 347-0459
cgeorge@nachc.com
www.nachc.com

Cynthia Gibson

Program Officer
Carnegie Corporation of New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022
P: (212) 207-6272
F: (212) 754-4073
CG@carnegie.org
www.carnegie.org

Amy Glasmeier

Professor of Geography
Penn State University
312 Walker Building
University Park, PA 16802
P: (814) 865-7323
akg1@ems.psu.edu
www.geog.psu.edu

Stephen Goldsmith

Board Chairman
Corporation for National and
Community Service
1200 K Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 606-5000
stephen.goldsmith@acs-inc.com
www.nationalservice.org

Silvia B. Golombek, Ph.D.

Vice President of Programs
Youth Service America
1101 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 296-2992 (ext.16)
F: (202) 296-4030
Sgolombek@ysa.org
www.ysa.org

John S. Gomperts

CEO
Experience Corps
3751 Jenifer Street NW
Washington DC 20015
P: (202) 478-6143
jgomperts@experiencecorps.org
www.experiencecorps.org

Rev. W. Wilson Goode, Sr.

Senior Advisor on Faith-Based Initiatives
Public/Private Ventures
2000 Market Street
Suite 600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
P: (215) 551-4400
F: (215) 557-4469
www.ppv.org

Rick Greene

Program Specialist
Administration on Aging
1 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Room 5608
Washington, DC 20201
P: (202) 357-3586
F: (202) 357-3549
rick.greene@aoa.gov
http://www.aoa.gov

Patricia Griffin

VP of Government Relations and
Strategic Partnerships
Public Allies, Inc.
1120 Connecticut Ave. Suite 435
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 293-3969
F: (202) 822-1196
triciag@publicallies.org
www.publicallies.org

Francisco Guajardo

Executive Director
Llano Grande
PO Box 127
Edcouch, Texas 78538
P: (956) 262-4474
f_guajardo@yahoo.com
www.llanogrande.org

Michael Hackman

Director of Public Policy
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
230 North 13th Street
Philadelphia, PA
19107-1538
P: (215) 567-7000
F: (215) 567-0394
www.bbbsa.org

Sam Halperin

Senior Fellow
American Youth Policy Forum
1836 Jefferson Place NW
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 775-9731
F: (202) 775-9733
shalperin@aypf.org
www.aypf.org

Ira Harkavy

Director
Center for Community Partnerships
University of Pennsylvania
133 South 36th Street -- Suite 519
Philadelphia, PA 19104-3246
P: (215) 898-5351
F: (215) 573-2799
harkavy@pobox.upenn.edu
www.upenn.edu/ccp

Karen S. Harlow

Director
Graduate Program in Health
Administration
School of Public and Environmental
Affairs
Indiana University
Indianapolis, IN 46202
P: (317) 278-0343
kharlow@iupui.edu
www.indiana.edu/~speaweb

Loren Harris

Program Officer, Community &
Resource Development
Ford Foundation
320 E. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017
P: (212) 573-5223
F: (212) 351-3659
l.s.harris@fordfound.org
www.fordfound.org/program/
community.cfm

Natashia M. Heggins

Director of After School Programs
Civic Works
2701 St. Lo Drive
Baltimore, MD
P: (410) 366-8533 (ex.213)
F: (410) 366-1831
sowlm8@msn.com
http://www.civicworks.com/

Mavis Hill

Executive Director
Tyrell County CDC
PO Box 58
Columbia, NC 27925
P: (252) 796-1991
tccdc@beachlink.com

Hartley Hobson

Vice President
Innovation Center for Community
and Youth Development
7100 Connecticut Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
P: (301) 961-2847
F: (301) 961-2831
hhobson@theinnovationcenter.org
www.theinnovationcenter.org

Elizabeth Hollander

Executive Director
Campus Compact: The Project for
Public & Community Service
Brown University, Box 1975
Providence, RI 02912-1975
P: (401) 867-3934
F: (401) 867-3925
ehollander@compact.org
www.compact.org

Melinda Baskin Hudson

Sr. Vice President, National Partnerships
America's Promise — The Alliance for
Youth
909 N. Washington St., Suite 400
Alexandria, VA 22314
P: 1-800-365-0153
F: (703)-535-3904
melindah@americaspromise.org
www.americaspromise.org

Gail Hunt

Executive Director
National Alliance for Caregiving
4720 Montgomery Lane, Suite 642
Bethesda, MD 20814
P: (301) 718-8444
gailhunt.nac@erols.com
www.caregiving.org

JoAnn Jastrzab

Principal Research Associate
Abt Associates Inc
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
P: (617) 349-2372
F: (617) 520-2954
JoAnn_Jastrzab@abtassoc.com
www.abtassoc.com

Deb Jospin

sagawa/jospin
16 Primrose Street
Chevy Chase, MD 20815-4229
P: (202) 256-1806
djospin@comcast.net
www.sagawajospin.com

Christopher R. Johnson

Manager
50+ Volunteering
Points of Light Foundation
1400 I Street NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 729-3215
F: (202) 729-8100
chjohnson@pointsoflight.org
www.pointsoflight.org/centers/older_ad
ult.cfm

Tom Jones

Vice President
Habitat for Humanity International
1010 Vermont Ave. NW, Suite 900
Washington DC 20005
P: (202) 628-9171 x105
tjones@hfh.org
www.habitat.org

Andrea Kane

Director of Public Policy
National Campaign to Prevent Teen
Pregnancy
1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 478-8554
F: (202) 478-8588
akane@teenpregnancy.org
www.teenpregnancy.org

Judy Karasik

2016 Luzerne Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910
P: (301) 585-0668
karasik@wdn.com

Irv Katz

President & CEO
National Collaboration for Youth/
National Assembly of Health & Human
Service Organizations
1319 F Street, NW, Suite 601
Washington, DC 20004
P: (202) 347-2080
F: (202) 393-4517
irv@nassembly.org
www.nassembly.org/nassembly/
html/about.html

Sean King

Director
A STAR! in Western Maryland
Braddock House
101 Braddock Road
Frostburg, MD 21532
P: (301) 687-7615
F: (301) 687-1041
sking@frostburg.edu
www.frostburg.edu/clife/lanec/
volunteerism/wmdastar/
sitesobjectives.htm

Cherie Krug

Executive Director, Center for
Volunteerism and National Service
Frostburg State University
Braddock House
101 Braddock Road
Frostburg, MD 21532
P: (301) 687-4210
F: (301) 687-1041
ckrug@frostburg.edu
www.frostburg.edu/clife/lanec/
volunteerism/volunteerism.htm

Carol Kuhre

Executive Director
Rural Action
PO Box 157
Trimble, OH 45782
P: (740) 767-4938
ckuhre@ruralaction.org
www.ruralaction.org

Adraine LaRoza

Executive Director
Volunteer Manatee/The ManaTEEN
Club
5131 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, FL 34209
P: (941) 761-3207
F: (941) 761-0458
Manateens@aol.com
www.manateens.org

Leslie Lenkowsky

CEO
Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
(202) 606-5000
www.nationalservice.org

Joanna Lennon

Executive Director
East Bay Conservation Corps
1021 Third Street
Oakland, CA 94607
P: (510) 992-7815
F: (510) 992-7955
jlennon@ebcc-school.org
www.ebcc-school.org

Michael Lipsky

Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017 USA
P: (212) 573-4786
F: (212) 697-4820
m.lipsky@fordfound.org
www.fordfound.org

Laura Lockwood

AmeriCorps Promise Fellow
ManaTEENS
5131 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, FL 34209
P: (941) 761-3207
F: (941) 761-0458
manateens@aol.com
www.manateens.org

Robert Lott

Dutko Fellow/ DLC
600 Pennsylvania Ave SE
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20003
P: (202) 608-1288
robertslott@yahoo.com

Marc Magee

Director, Progressive Policy Institute
600 Pennsylvania Ave SE
Suite 400
Washington DC 20003
P: (202) 547-0001
F: (202) 544-5014
mmagee@dlcppi.org
www.ppionline.org

Sally Maggard

National Program Leader
Economic and Community Systems
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Mail Stop: 2215
Washington, DC 20250
P: (202) 720-0741
F: (202) 690-2975
smaggard@reusda.gov
www.reusda.gov/ecs/resdpro.htm

Sandy Markwood

Chief Executive Officer,
National Association of Area Agencies
on Aging (n4a)
927 15th St., NW, Sixth Floor,
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 296-8130
F: (202) 296-8134
smarkwood@nra.org
www.n4a.org

Rosie Mauk

Director
AmeriCorps
Corporation for National and
Community Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
P: (202) 606-5000, x386
rmauk@cns.gov
www.americorps.org

Nancy McFall-Jean

Policy Analyst
Alliance for Children and Families
1319 F Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
P: (202) 313-3570
F: (202) 393-3571
njean@alliance1.org
www.alliance1.org

Stephanie McGency

Executive Director
Grantmakers for Children, Youth and
Families
1522 K Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 962-3940
F: (202) 393-4148
smcgency@gcyf.org
www.gcyf.org

Edward Metz, Ph.D.

Life Cycle Institute
Catholic University
Washington, DC 20064
P: (202) 319-5999
F: (202) 319-6267
metze@cua.edu

Catherine Milton

President
 Friends of the Children – National
 44 N.E. Morris
 Portland, OR 97212-3015
 P: (503) 281-6633 (ext.126)
 F: (503) 281-6819
cmilton@Friendstochildren.org
www.friendsofthechildren.org

Jane Oates

Senior Education Advisor
 Office of Senator Kennedy
 Committee on Health, Education, Labor
 and Pensions
 727 Hart Building
 Washington, DC 20510
 (202) 224-8460
 (202) 228-0924
jane_oates@labor.senate.gov
kennedy.senate.gov

Ann O’Leary

Legislative Director
 Office of Senator Hillary Clinton
 United States Senate
 476 Russell Senate Office Building
 Washington, DC 20510
 (202) 224-4451
 (202) 228-0282
ann_oleary@clinton.senate.gov
clinton.senate.gov

Tanya Omeltchenko

Research Assistant
 Innovations in Civic Participation
 1776 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.
 Suite 201
 Washington, DC 20036
 P: (202) 775-0290
 F: (202) 833-8581
omeltchenko@icicp.org
www.icicp.org

Vincent Pan

Co-founder and Executive Director
 Heads Up: A University Neighborhood
 Initiative
 645 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
 Suite 300
 Washington, DC 20003
 P: (202) 544-4468, x24
 F: (202) 544-4437
vp@headsup-dc.org
www.headsup-dc.org

Sarah S. Pearson

Project Director
 American Youth Policy Forum
 1836 Jefferson Place, NW
 Washington, DC 20036
 P: (202) 775-9731
 F: (202) 775-9733
spearson@aypf.org
www.aypf.org

Jaia Peterson

Public Policy Director
 Generations United
 122 C St. NW., Suite 820
 Washington, DC 20001
 P: (202) 638-1263
 F: (202) 638-7555
jpeterson@gu.org
www.gu.org

Ruthellen H. Phillips

Director
 Energy Express, West Virginia University
 Allen Hall 706
 PO Box 6602
 Morgantown, WV 26506
 P: (304) 293-3855
rhphillips@mail.wvu.edu
www.energyexpress.wvu.edu

John Pribyl

Senior Companions Director
 Lutheran Social Services of Minnesota
 2414 Park Ave
 Minneapolis, MN 55404
 P: (612) 879-5214
 F: (612) 879-5220
jpribyl@lssmn.org
www.lssmn.org

Sally Prouty

President
 National Association of Service and
 Conservation Corps
 666 11th St, NW
 Suite 1000
 Washington, DC 20001-4525
 P: (202) 737-6272
 F: (202) 737-6277
sprouty@nascc.org
www.nascc.org

Donna Rabiner, Ph.D.

Health and Aging Program
 Research Triangle Institute International
 3040 Cornwallis Rd.
 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
 P: (919) 541-1220
 F: (919) 990-8454
rabiner@rti.org
www.rti.org/page.cfm?nav=7

Jill Rademacher

Vice President
 The Case Foundation
 1720 N Street, NW
 Washington DC, 20036
 P: (202) 467-5788
 F: (202) 775-9155
jillrademacher@aol.com
www.case.org

Dwight Rasmussen

Project Director: Senior
 Companion/Foster Grandparent and
 AmeriCorps Programs
 Salt Lake County Aging Services
 Government Center-South Building
 2001 South State Street
 Suite S-1500
 Salt Lake City, Utah 84190-2300
 P: (801) 468-2775
 F: (801) 468-2989
drasmussen@co.sl.c.ut.us
www.slcoagingservices.org

Stephen Ristau

CEO
Turning Points Research Institute
121 Deer Run Drive
Colchester, CT 06415
P: (860) 267-1671
F: (860) 267-1737
ristau@adelphia.net

Jennie Rodgers

Event Services Coordinator
The Roberts Event Group
3901 Manayunk Avenue
Unit 112
Philadelphia, PA 19128
P: (215) 887-7880
F: (215) 887-2003
www.robertseventgroup.com

Margaret Erin Rodgers

Innovations in Civic Participation
1776 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.
Suite 201
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 775-0290
F: (202) 833-8581
www.icicp.org

Sandra Rosenblith

Senior Vice President
Rural LISC
1825 K Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
P: (202) 785-2908
F: (202) 785-4331
srosenblith@liscnet.org
www.ruralisc.org

David Rymph

Senior Research Associate
Corporation for National And
Community Service
1201 New York, NW
Washington, DC 20525
P: (202) 606-5000 (ext.223)
F: (202) 565-2785
drymph@cns.gov
www.nationalservice.org

Shirley Sagawa

sagawa/jospin
12 West Oak Street
Alexandria, VA 22301
P: (703) 593-4765
F: (703) 548-6374
ssagawa@sagawajospin.com
www.sagawajospin.com

Mikki Sager

North Carolina Director
The Conservation Fund
PO Box 271
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
P: (919) 967-2223
mikkisager@aol.com
www.conservationfund.org

Tess Scannell

Director-National Senior Corps
Corporation for National and
Community Service
1201 New York Avenue NW
Washington DC 20525
P: (202) 606-5000 (ext.300)
F: (202) 565-2743
tscannell@cns.gov
www.seniorcorps.org

Eric Schwarz

President
Citizen Schools, Inc.
308 Congress St.
Boston, MA 02210
P: (617) 695-2300
ericschwarz@citizenschools.org
www.citizenschools.org

Mike Skonieczny

Office of Rep. Rosa DeLauro
2262 Rayburn House Office Building
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515
P: (202) 225-3661
F: (202) 225-4890
michael.skonieczny@mail.house.gov
www.house.gov/delauro/index.html

Dr. Earl Shelp

Interfaith CarePartners
701 N. Post Oak Rd, Suite 330
Houston, TX 77024
P: (713) 682-5995
F: (713) 682-0639
info@interfaithcarepartners.org
www.interfaithcarepartners.org/

Robert Sherman, Ph.D.

Program Officer, Effective Citizenry
Surdna Foundation
330 Madison Avenue, 30th Floor
New York, NY 10017-5001
P: (212) 557-0010 x229
F: (212) 557-0003
rsherman@surdna.org
www.surdna.org/programs/
citizenry.html

Clark Smith

National Association of Child Care
Resource and Referral Agencies
1319 F. Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20004-1106
P: (202) 393-5501, x123
gcs@naccrra.org
www.naccrra.org

Gene Sofer

Susquehanna Group
4615 29th Pl. NW
Washington DC 20008
HP: (202) 686-1040
F: (202) 363-6189
efsofer@aol.com

John Spence

Director
Texas Center for Service-Learning
2538 S. Congress Ave, Suite 300
Austin, TX, 78704
P: (512) 441-1147 (ext. 101)
F: (512) 441-1181
jspence@esc14.net
www.txsl.org

Dana M. Stein

President/Executive Director
Civic Works, Inc.
2701 St. Lo Drive
Baltimore, MD 21213
P: (410) 366-8533
F: (410) 366-1831
dstein@civicworks.com
/www.civicworks.com

Dorothy Stoneman

President
YouthBuild U.S.A.
58 Day Street
P.O. Box 440322
Somerville, MA 02144
P: (617) 623-9900
F: (617) 623-4359
dstoneman@youthbuild.org
www.youthbuild.org

Susan Stroud

Executive Director
Innovations in Civic Participation
1776 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.
Suite 201
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 775-0290
F: (202) 833-8581
stroud@icicp.org
www.icicp.org

Ronald H. Sunderland

Co-founder
Interfaith CarePartners
701 N. Post Oak Rd. Suite 330
Houston, TX 77024
P: (713) 682-5995
F: (713) 682-0639
info@interfaithcarepartners.org
www.interfaithcarepartners.org

Mia Sussman

Dutko Fellow/ Program Assistant
International Senior Lawyers Project
2001 K Street
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 912-5036
msussm@yahoo.com
www.islp.org

Rhonda Taylor

Corporation for National and
Community Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 200, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20525
P: (202) 606-5000 (ext.282)
F: (202) 565-2794
rtaylor@cns.gov
www.usafreedomcorps.gov

Corinne Thatcher

Student
Pennsylvania State University
250 Camelot Lane
State College, PA 16803
P: (814) 867-6202
cet131@psu.edu

Michael Tierney

Step By Step
Executive Director
659 Big Ugly Creek Road, East
Harts, WV 25524
P: (304) 414-4452
F: (304) 414-4410
stepbystep@wvdremers.org
www.wvdreamers.org

Rachel Tompkins

President
The Rural School and Community
Trust
1825 K Street NW, Suite 703
Washington, DC 20006
P: (202) 955-7177
F: (202) 955-7179
rachel.tompkins@ruraledu.org
www.ruraledu.org

William Treanor

Publisher
Youth Today
1200 17th Street, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
P: (202) 785-0764, x105
F: (202) 728-0657
bilt@youthtoday.org
www.youthtoday.org/youthtoday

Andrea Turner

Senior Companions Program
City of Oakland
150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, #4340
Oakland, CA 94612
P: (510) 238-3080
F: (510) 238-7207
aturner@oakland.net
www.nationalservice.org/
stateprofiles/ca_intro.html

Gary Turner

Deputy Director
Hands on Atlanta
1605 Peachtree Str.
Atlanta, GA 30309
P: (404) 872-2755
F: (404) 872-2251
GTurner@handsonatlanta.org
www.handsonatlanta.org

Nicole Tysvaer

Art in Learning
PO Box 444
Jersey City, NJ 07303-0444
P: (201) 344-2355
F: (201) 656-1623
nicole@artinlearning.org
www.artinlearning.org

Wendy Wheeler

President
Innovation Center for Community and
Youth Development
7100 Connecticut Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
P: (301) 961-2867
F: (301) 961-2831
wwheeler@theinnovationcenter.org
www.theinnovationcenter.org

Arnold Wickens

Director of Consulting
Community Service Volunteers
237 Pentonville Road
London N1 9NJ UK
P: 0044 20 7643 1402
awickens@csv.org.uk
www.csv.org.uk

Christen Schaefer Wiggins

Director of National Service Programs
Habitat for Humanity
1010 Vermont Ave. NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 628-9171 (ext.118)
www.habitat.org

Laura Wilson, Ph.D.

Director - Center on Aging
University of Maryland
2367 HHP Bldg., Valley Drive
College Park, MD 20742
P: (301) 405-2470
F: (301) 405-2542
lw20@umail.umd.edu
www.hhp.umd.edu/AGING

Lakshman Yapa

Professor of Geography
Pennsylvania State University Dept. of
Geography
321 Walker Building
University Park, PA 16802
P: (814) 865 1187
F: (814) 863-7943
lxy3@psu.edu
www.geog.psu.edu

APPENDIX II

Participant Bios

Susan V. Berresford **President, Ford Foundation**

Ms. Berresford became President of the Ford Foundation in 1996. At the time of her election as President, Ms. Berresford was Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Foundation.

Ms. Berresford joined the Ford Foundation in 1970 as a Project Assistant in the Division of National Affairs. Between 1972 and 1980 she served as a Program Officer in that division. In 1980 she was named Officer in Charge of the Foundation's Women's programs. She became Vice President for the Foundation's U.S. and International Affairs programs in 1981 and subsequently served as Vice President of the Program Division in charge of worldwide programming for the Foundation from 1989.

Prior to joining the Foundation, Ms. Berresford served as a Program Officer for the Neighborhood Youth Corps from 1965 until 1967. In 1967-68, she worked for the Manpower Career Development Agency, where she was responsible for the evaluation of training, education, and work programs.

Ms. Berresford attended Vassar College and then studied American history at Radcliffe College, where she graduated cum laude in 1965. Ms. Berresford is a Board Member of the Council on Foundations and a member of the Trilateral Commission and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She also has served on the Boards of the Hermine and Robert Popper Foundation and the Chase Manhattan Corporation, and as a member of the Advisory Committee of the Center for Global Partnership.

John Bridgeland **Director, USA Freedom Corps**

On January 30, 2002, President George W. Bush named John Bridgeland as Assistant to the President and Director of the USA Freedom Corps at the White House. Prior to his appointment, John Bridgeland

served as the Director of the Domestic Policy Council at the White House. He co-directed the policy transition for the Bush-Cheney Transition team and was Deputy Policy Director to Bush for President.

Mr. Bridgeland founded Civic Solutions, a company that worked with non-profits, foundations, faith-based institutions and corporations on public policy issues. Prior to that, he served as Chief of Staff to Congressman Rob Portman and practiced law in the New York and Paris offices of Davis Polk & Wardwell.

He is a graduate of Harvard College and the University of Virginia School of Law.

Jerry Brant **President and COO, Northern Cambria** **Community Development Corporation** **(NORCAM)**

Mr. Brant has served in this position since 1989. Prior to this, he was executive director of the organization since 1987. Before coming to NORCAM, Mr. Brant worked for thirteen years as a member of the Cambria County District Attorney's Office investigative staff. In addition to this experience, Mr. Brant served as a member of the Barnesboro Borough Council for eight years with six years as the Council's president. He served four years as the Business District Authority's President during which time the Community was chosen to participate in the Main Street Program. Mr. Brant was elected to three consecutive terms on the Pennsylvania State Democratic Committee and in 1980 was elected as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention.

Mr. Brant holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science from St. Francis College, Loretto, Pennsylvania and continued his education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Sarah Brown
Director, The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy

The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy is a private, non-profit initiative organized in 1996 to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate by one-third by 2005. Ms. Brown holds undergraduate and graduate degrees from Stanford University and the University of North Carolina. Before co-founding the National Campaign with Isabel Sawhill, a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, she was a senior study director at the Institute of Medicine (a component of the National Academy of Sciences) where, among other projects, she completed a major study on unintended pregnancy, which resulted in the report, "The Best Intentions: Unintended Pregnancy and the Well-Being of Children and Families." Other projects at the Institute which she directed centered on health care reform, substance abuse among pregnant women, access to prenatal care, and preventing low birth weight.

She serves on the boards of many organizations, including the Alan Guttmacher Institute and the District of Columbia's Mayor's Advisory Board on Teenage Pregnancies and Out-of-Wedlock Births. In addition, she is a member of numerous committees and advisory groups, such as the Early Life and Adolescent Health Policy Working Group of Harvard University, the advisory councils of Teen People magazine, and the Department of Maternal and Child Health at Johns Hopkins University. She recently completed Board membership with the Alan Guttmacher Institute and the American college of Obstetrics and Gynecology.

Ms. Brown has received numerous awards, including the Institute of Medicine's Cecil Award for Excellence in Research, the John MacQueen Award for Excellence in Maternal and Child Health from the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the Harriet Hylton Barr Distinguished Service Award from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Martha May Elliot Award of the American Public Health Association, and the Spirit of Service Award from the National Organization on Adolescent Pregnancy, Parenting, and Prevention. She is married to Winthrop Brown and lives in Washington, D.C. The Browns have three daughters, ages 16, 20, and 22.

Carol Buster
AmeriCorps Program Director, Little Dixie Community Action Agency

Ms. Buster has served in this position since September 2002. Little Dixie administers two AmeriCorps environmental programs at fourteen project sites in six counties in southeast Oklahoma. She worked as the AmeriCorps Planner under a planning grant for the most recent Little Dixie AmeriCorps program from January 2002 until September 2002.

For ten years prior to that, Ms. Buster worked for a railroad company in Hugo in the position of Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer in charge of cash management and human resources. Ms. Buster is a graduate of Texas A&M — Commerce, Texas with a BS degree in Psychology and Sociology.

T. Allan Comp, Ph.D.
**Founder and Project Historian, AMD&ART;
 Program Analyst, Watershed Assistance Team,
 U.S. Office of Surface Mining, Department of
 the Interior**

Dr. Comp leads a team of artists, designers, scientists, historians and community groups in addressing not only AMD (abandoned mine drainage), but the healing and community revitalization that must be part of any sustainable environmental initiative. AMD&ART was conceived to artfully transform environmental liabilities to community assets — and to create stronger communities in the process. The project links environmental science, local history, public art and community interests to build a place of healing by reclaiming the damage and creating systems that become new places of community pride. AMD&ART projects and AMD treatment systems become recreational sites, art parks, educational centers, and historical exhibits that clean the water and reach people at the same time. Dr. Comp will discuss the trans-disciplinary collaboration that is AMD&ART and the remarkable success of the project in the midst of the poverty and passivity of Appalachia.

Dr. Comp worked for the National Park Service for 12 years, in the private sector as both a developer of historic buildings and a consultant in heritage development for another 10. Most recently, he has been the Program Analyst for the Division of Reclamation Support, Office of Surface Mining.

Katherine “Sissy” Corr
Executive Director, Notre Dame Mission
Volunteer — AmeriCorps

In 1994 Sr. Katherine “Sissy” Corr, SND was handed a daunting assignment by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur: transform the small service program Notre Dame Mission Volunteers into a thriving national non-profit organization. Sissy revitalized the organization, achieving more than growth. She paired Notre Dame Mission Volunteers with the national service initiative AmeriCorps, allowing for increased funding, recruitment, and most importantly, a greater opportunity for Notre Dame Mission Volunteers to provide education and literacy skills to children, youth, and adults. Today, Notre Dame Mission Volunteers — AmeriCorps (NDMVA) has over 300 members in 13 cities nationwide serving in National and State Direct programs. Due to Sissy’s initiative, NDMVA influences tens of thousands hearts and minds in the communities where members live and serve.

Sister Corr owes much success to her past experience directing Jobs With Peace (1981–1992) and leading the Chesapeake Province of Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur (1991–1994). Sissy’s career initially started in the classroom teaching primary grades after graduating from Trinity College in Washington, D.C. She earned her M.A. in Sociology from the New School of Social Research in New York. In addition, Sissy gained most valuable training in community organizing and volunteer recruitment from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Atlanta and the Institute for Effective Action in Los Angeles.

Carol Crecy
Director, Center for Communication and
Consumer Services, U.S. Administration on
Aging (AoA), Department of Health and Human
Services

The U.S. Administration on Aging (AoA) is the one federal agency dedicated exclusively to policy development, planning, and the delivery of supportive home and community-based services to our nation’s diverse population of older Americans and their caregivers. Ms. Crecy provides leadership on the provision consumer information and education, contact with the media and the Congress and international activities. In this role

Ms. Crecy advocates for the independence and dignity of all older Americans.

Since July of 1979, Ms. Crecy has served in several management positions within the Administration on Aging. She has also worked for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services and ACTION.

A native of Baltimore, Maryland, Ms. Crecy received her BA degree in psychology from the University of Maryland and a MBA degree from Trinity College in Washington, D.C. She has over 30 years of experience in managing human service programs within the Federal government.

Dee Davis
President, Center for Rural Strategies

Mr. Davis began his media career in 1973 as a trainee at Appalshop, an arts and cultural center devoted to exploring Appalachian life and social issues in Whitesburg, Kentucky. A native of Hazard, Kentucky, Mr. Davis went on to become the first president of Appalshop. During his 18 years as Appalshop’s executive producer, the organization created more than 50 public TV documentaries, established a media training program for Appalachian youth, and launched a number of initiatives that use media as a strategic tool in organization and development.

Mr. Davis has served as president and chairman of the board of the Independent Television Service, president of Kentucky Citizens for the Arts, and as a panelist and consultant to numerous private and public agencies. He was the first youth appointee to the Kentucky Commission on Children and Youth and was a delegate to the White House Conference on Children in 1970.

He is a member of the Rural Advisory Committee of the Rural Network, a national association of rural community development organizations, and serves on advisory groups for the Open Society Institute and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. He received an English degree from the University of Kentucky. Dee lives in Whitesburg, Kentucky.

Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro — Connecticut

Congresswoman DeLauro was first elected to Congress from Connecticut's Third District in 1990, and is currently serving her seventh term. Congresswoman DeLauro sits on the House Appropriations Committee, and serves on the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education and Agriculture Subcommittees. She also serves on the House Budget Committee. In 1999, she was elected Assistant to the Democratic Leader by her colleagues, making her the second highest ranking Democratic woman in the House of Representatives. She was re-elected to this position in 2000. In 2002, she was appointed co-chair of the House Democratic Steering Committee.

Since coming to Congress, Congresswoman DeLauro has built a solid reputation for constituent service and hard work. In 1998, 2000 and 2002, she was recognized as one of the House of Representative's top "Workhorses" by *Washingtonian* magazine, and was called a "hero for working families" by nationally syndicated columnist Tom Oliphant.

Congresswoman DeLauro has helped Connecticut families get ahead by making economic improvement a top priority. During her tenure in Congress, she has taken a special interest in health care issues. From her position on the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Appropriations Subcommittee, Congresswoman DeLauro has fought to increase funding for breast and cervical cancer screenings and research. DeLauro has also authored legislation to ensure longer hospital stays for women undergoing breast cancer surgery that enjoys bipartisan support.

In 1996, Congresswoman DeLauro founded the "Kick Butts Connecticut" (KBC) initiative, which recruits middle school students to act as anti-smoking peer counselors for elementary school children. Since that time, more than 3,000 Connecticut children have taken the KBC pledge not to smoke.

Congresswoman DeLauro continues to work to reduce crime and make our communities safer. Since 1993, she has involved young people in the national debate on crime and violence through her Anti-Crime Youth Council, a group composed of area high school students. ACYC members meet on a regular basis and work together to combat crime in their schools and their communities.

Prior to her election to the House of Representatives, Rosa DeLauro served as Executive Director of EMILY'S List, a national organization dedicated to increasing the number of women in elected office. She served as Executive Director of Countdown '87, the national campaign that successfully stopped U.S. military aid to the Nicaraguan Contras. From 1981-1987, Congresswoman DeLauro served as Chief of Staff to U.S. Senator Christopher Dodd.

Congresswoman DeLauro is a graduate of Marymount College, where she received her B.A. with honors. She earned her Masters in International Politics from Columbia University, and studied at the London School of Economics. She is married to Stanley Greenberg, President of Greenberg-Quinlan Research, Inc., a public issues research and polling firm. Their children — Anna, Kathryn and Jonathan Greenberg — are all grown and pursuing careers.

Cynthia (Mil) Duncan Director, Community and Resource Development at the Ford Foundation; author of Worlds Apart; Why Poverty Persists in Rural America

The Community and Resource Development Unit funds place-based community development and environment and development work in poor urban and rural communities in the US as well as Africa, Latin America, and Asia. Prior to this appointment Dr. Duncan was Professor and Chair of the Sociology Department at the University of New Hampshire, where she taught undergraduate and graduate courses in poverty and inequality, political sociology, social change, and qualitative and applied methodology. She is the author of *Worlds Apart: Why Poverty Persists in Rural America* (Yale University Press 1999), a study that compares opportunities for mobility and change in three rural communities in the US. *Worlds Apart* won the American Sociological Association's Community and Urban Sociology Section Robert E Park award in 2001. She is also the author of *Rural Poverty in America*, an edited collection on rural poverty, and numerous articles on rural poverty, social change, and development. In addition to her research on poor rural US communities, she conducted research in Maine, northwest Newfoundland, Iceland and Norway on how

fishing families and communities adapted to the groundfish crisis during the late 1990s. Before joining UNH's faculty in 1989 she was Associate Director and co-founder of the Aspen Institute's Rural Economic Policy program (now the Community Strategies Group), and prior to that she was research director at the Mountain Association for Community Economic Development, a regional economic development organization in Berea, Kentucky. She received her BA in English from Stanford University, and her MA and Ph.D. from the University of Kentucky.

Tom Endres

President, Endres & Associates Consulting

Mr. Endres has held a variety of national, regional, and state positions: Consultant, Community Service, AARP; Deputy Director and Director, National Senior Service Corps, Corporation for National Service; Senior Companion National Program Director, ACTION Older American Volunteer Programs; State Program Director, Maine State ACTION Office; Regional Program Operations Officer, ACTION Regional Office, Boston, MA; District Program Director — ME/NH/VT, ACTION, Region I; Program Director — VISTA Oregon; and Peace Corp Volunteer and Training Director.

Since serving in the Peace Corps in Colombia, Mr. Endres has been active in his community: Consultant (pro bono) for National Associations and Non Profit Organizations; Co-founder, Vice President and President, Center for Grieving Children; Board of Directors, Opportunity Farm for Boys; President, Church Council, First Congregational Church; Board of Directors, Center for Voluntary Action; Founding member, University of Southern Maine's Community Leadership Institute.

James Firman

President and CEO, National Council on Aging

Dr. Firman is one of the nation's leading innovators and advocates on behalf of older persons. Since joining NCOA in 1995, Dr. Firman has revitalized and helped chart a new course for the organization. Under his leadership, NCOA has strengthened its advocacy programs, developed several ground-breaking R&D

initiatives, improved membership benefits, introduced new national service programs, and forged several innovative partnerships with corporations.

For 25 years, Dr. Firman has been a leading force for innovations in services and programs for older persons. While at NCOA, he spearheaded the development and launch of the BenefitsCheckUp, an award-winning national service initiative that in its first year helped more than 625,000 older people to learn about all of the federal and state benefits to which they are entitled. From 1996–2000, Dr. Firman led Independent Choices, a \$4 million initiative funded by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation that supported R&D to increase consumer-directed long-term care services for older persons and people with disabilities.

Prior to joining NCOA as president and CEO in January 1995, Dr. Firman was, for 10 years, president and CEO of the United Seniors Health Cooperative (USHC), a nonprofit consumers organization that he founded with Arthur Flemming, Esther Peterson, T. Franklin Williams, and other leaders in the field. At USHC, Dr. Firman directed the development of the nation's first line-of-credit reverse mortgages, the Cooperative Caring Network, a major community-wide volunteer service-credit program that helps frail and disabled persons remain at home, and early generations of benefits screening software.

From 1981 to 1984, Dr. Firman served as a senior program officer at The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, where he helped develop initiatives in aging and healthcare finance, as well as the model Interfaith Volunteer Caregivers program. He is a co-founder of Grantmakers in Aging.

Dr. Firman is a noted expert and consumer advocate on many issues affecting older persons — including public policy, home care, long-term care, health insurance, finance issues, and intergenerational programs. As a member of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners Advisory Committee on federal implementation of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1990, he successfully led negotiations to include home care and preventive health benefits in the standardized Medigap policies. He also was a commissioner of the American Bar Association's Commission on Legal Problems of the Elderly. In 1994, he was awarded the Health Care Financing Administration's

Beneficiary Services Certificate of Merit. He has provided expert testimony before many congressional committees.

Dr. Firman currently serves as chair of the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, a coalition of 47 of the nation's largest organizations concerned with the well-being of older Americans. Dr. Firman holds M.B.A. and Ed.D. degrees from Columbia University. He has written several books and many articles on issues in aging, for consumers as well as professionals.

Amy K. Glasmeier
Professor of Geography, Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Glasmeier is the director of the Center on Trade, Technology, and Economic Growth, Institute for Policy Research and Evaluation at Pennsylvania State University. The center conducts research on the implications of globalization for local and state economies. In 1996-1998, she was the John D. Whisman Scholar for the Appalachian Regional Commission, where she provided policy analysis and advice on regional economic development and poverty alleviation. Dr. Glasmeier has published three books on international industrial and economic development, including *High Tech America* (1986), *The High-Tech Potential: Economic Development in Rural America* (1991), and *From Combines to Computers: Rural Services Development in the Age of Information Technology* (1995), and more than 50 scholarly articles. Her popular writings include *Global Squeeze on Rural America: Opportunities, Threats, and Challenges From NAFTA, GATT, and Processes of Globalization* (1994), and *Branch Plants and Rural Development in the Age of Globalization* (1995). She has served as a consultant with the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the U.S. Department of Transportation, and the Regional Government of Emilia Romagna, Italy. She currently is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council Board on the Constructed Environment. She

has testified before the United States Congress and the Pennsylvania House of Representatives on issues related to international trade, globalization, economic development, and poverty alleviation. Her current research focuses on community impacts of globalization, regional development, poverty alleviation, and industrial change. Dr. Glasmeier holds a professional master's degree and a Ph.D. in city and regional planning from the University of California at Berkeley.

Stephen Goldsmith
Chair, Corporation for National Service; Special Advisor to the President on Faith-based and Nonprofit Initiatives; former Mayor of Indianapolis

While serving two terms as Mayor of Indianapolis, Steve earned a national reputation for innovations in government. As Mayor of America's 12th largest city, he reduced government spending, cut the city's bureaucracy, held the line on taxes, eliminated counter-productive regulations, and identified more than \$400 million in savings. He reinvested the savings by leading a transformation of downtown Indianapolis that has been held up as a national model. By leveraging public and private participation, a once dormant downtown realized billions in new investment, thousands of new jobs and housing units and an increase of 20 million visitors a year. This effort was part of a larger city effort that saw more police officers on the street and the implementation of a broader \$1.3 billion infrastructure improvement program. Prior to his two terms as Mayor he was Marion County District Attorney for 13 years. Stephen currently serves as Special Advisor to President Bush on faith-based and not-for-profit initiatives and served as chief domestic policy advisor to the Bush campaign.

John Gomperts
CEO and Executive Director, Experience Corps

Prior to joining Civic Ventures, Mr. Gomperts was the chief operating officer of Public Education Network (PEN), the nation's largest network of community-based school reform organizations. As COO of the Public Education Network, Mr. Gomperts was responsible for the daily operations of the organization, and oversaw the effort to increase PEN's national

profile and influence. Mr. Gomperts has extensive experience as a senior leader in government and the non-profit sector. Before joining the Public Education Network, Mr. Gomperts was chief of staff at the Corporation for National Service, the agency that administers AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America, and the Senior Corps. At the Corporation, he spearheaded the efforts to rebuild bi-partisan support for national service, to expand service opportunities, and to modernize and improve the Corporation's internal operations. Before joining the Corporation for National Service, Mr. Gomperts worked in senior policy positions in the U.S. Senate, first as legislative director for Sen. Harris Wofford of Pennsylvania, and then as deputy director of the Senate Democratic Leadership Committee, working for Sen. Tom Daschle of South Dakota and Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts.

Rev. Wilson Goode
Executive Director, Amachi Program; former Mayor of Philadelphia

In the early 1960s, Rev. Goode worked as a probation officer, insurance claims adjuster and a building maintenance firm supervisor before serving a tour of duty in the United States Army in 1962. His political career took shape in 1969 when he was appointed the Executive Director of the Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement. The council's mission was to revitalize neighborhoods and create affordable housing for the poorer citizens of Philadelphia. It was a position Rev. Goode took to immediately and one that earned him a great deal of notoriety. During his tenure, he organized outreach programs in education, employment and economic development. In 1979, the Mayor of Philadelphia appointed Rev. Goode to be head of the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission. While chairman of the commission, he had the unenviable task of investigating the accident at Three Mile Island. In 1980, he became the first African American appointed to the position of Managing Director of the City of Philadelphia. His hands-on approach to city problems, such as sanitation and urban decay, further increased his popularity. Rev. Goode ran for and was elected Mayor of Philadelphia in 1983. His support reached across racial and economic lines and he served two terms as Mayor, leaving office in 1992.

Rev. Goode remains a pillar of the Philadelphia community. He received his Bachelor of Arts in Political Science in 1961 from Morgan State University. In 1968, he earned a Master's Degree in Governmental Administration from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Business, and he received his Doctorate of Ministry in May 2000. He is the Senior Advisor on Faith Based Initiatives and serves as the chair of the Free Library of Philadelphia. He and his wife, Velma, reside in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Francisco Guajardo
Llano Grande

Mr. Guajardo grew up along the Texas Mexican border, graduated from a rural public high school, Edcouch-Elsa High School, and taught at the same school between 1990 and 2002. During that time, his high school students, other community members, and he founded a nonprofit organization out of his classroom, called the Llano Grande Center for Research and Development. The Center's purpose is to cultivate the leadership capacities of rural south Texas youths through wide ranging community and economic development initiatives. The Center's current work includes an ongoing oral history project, a youth media center, a Spanish Language Immersion Institute, a nascent publishing house, an aggressive college prep program, and numerous other public spirited enterprises.

Ira Harkavy
Associate Vice President and founding Director, Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania

An historian with extensive experience building university-community partnerships, Dr. Harkavy teaches in the departments of history, urban studies, and city and regional planning. As Director of the Center for Community Partnerships, Dr. Harkavy has helped to develop service learning and academically-based community service courses as well as participatory action research projects that involve faculty and students from across the university.

Dr. Harkavy has been actively involved in working to involve colleges and universities in democratic partnerships with local public schools and their communities.

The West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC), a seventeen-year partnership to create university-assisted community schools that connect the University of Pennsylvania and the West Philadelphia community, emerged and developed from seminars and research projects he directs with other colleagues at Penn.

Dr. Harkavy is Executive Editor of *Universities and Community Schools* and an editorial board member of *Non-Profit Voluntary Sector Quarterly* and *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. He has written and lectured widely on the history and current practice of urban university-community partnerships and strategies for integrating the university missions of teaching, research, and service. He served as consultant to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to help create its Office of University Partnerships and is a Senior Fellow of the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics. Dr. Harkavy is a member of numerous international, national, regional, and local boards, including the International Consortium on Higher Education, Civic Responsibility, and Democracy (co-chair), National Coalition for Community Schools (chair), Philadelphia Higher Education Network for Neighborhood Development (co-chair), West Philadelphia Partnership (vice-chair), and the Board Policy Committee of Campus Compact. He is the recipient of Campus Compact's Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning (2002); and under his directorship, the Center for Community Partnerships received the inaugural William T. Grant Foundation Youth Development Prize sponsored in collaboration with the National Academy of Sciences' Board on Children, Youth and Families (2003) and a Best Practices/Outstanding Achievement Award from HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research (2000). Dr. Harkavy received his B.A. and his Ph.D. in history from the University of Pennsylvania.

Mavis Hill
Executive Director, Tyrrell County Community Development Corporation

Ms. Hill was a founder and current executive director of the Tyrrell County CDC located on Main Street in Columbia, North Carolina. As the executive director, Ms. Hill is responsible for the oversight of the Tyrrell County Youth Conservation Corps Program, the

Sustainable Careers Internship Program, Regional Enterprise Incubator Network and County Wide Leadership Development Program.

She is a graduate of Elizabeth City State University and has 8 years of experience in nonprofit management, project administration and fundraising. Ms. Hill is a past member of the North Carolina Economic Development Board, North Carolina Rural Prosperity Task Force and Partnership For Sounds, she currently serves as executive board member on the Northeastern North Carolina Black Chamber of Commerce and the North Carolina Business Incubator Association.

Ms. Hill was the 1998 recipient of the American Land Conservation Award for balancing economic development and environment, Tar Heel of the Week and was featured in June 1999 issue of Audubon Magazine. She has one son Joseph who is ten years old.

Deborah Jospin
Partner, sagawa/jospin

Ms. Jospin recently served as the Director of AmeriCorps. In that capacity, she oversaw the management and direction of the AmeriCorps Grants program, AmeriCorps*VISTA, AmeriCorps*National Civilian Community Corps, and the AmeriCorps Recruitment, Selection and Placement unit. During this period, AmeriCorps grew from an annual budget of \$150 million, with 18,000 members serving in 350 programs, to an annual budget of \$234 million, with 60,000 members serving in 925 programs. She is a member of the Board of Trustees of Tufts University.

Ms. Jospin recognized that such growth could only be sustained with a solid national service infrastructure in the states. Under her leadership and vision, the Corporation for National Service became an active partner with the 48 governor-appointed state service commissions, developing comprehensive performance standards for the commissions and supporting an association of commissions for peer technical assistance. She took the lead in launching a state-of-the-art web-based recruitment system, making it easier for potential AmeriCorps members. Prior to serving as the Director of AmeriCorps, Ms. Jospin was the Chief of Staff and Associate General Counsel at the Corporation for National Service.

Trained as an attorney and with a master's degree in public policy, Ms. Jospin's private sector experience includes five years as a litigation attorney in a large law firm and two and a half years as an associate in a public affairs and lobbying firm. She serves as the President of the Dan Dutko Memorial Foundation, which sponsors public policy management fellowships, and on the National Board of Advisors for the Tufts University College of Citizenship and Public Service.

Ms. Jospin is a graduate of Tufts University, the London School of Economics, and Georgetown University Law Center, where she served on the Law and Policy in International Business Journal.

Judy Karasik
Author and Independent Consultant

Ms. Karasik is a writer, editor, and consultant who has worked in government, higher education, non-profits, and the private sector. She was involved in national service from its beginnings, as the author of a 1990 study for the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation which surveyed the field that was about to become national service, as a founding Board Member of Public Allies, as a Team Leader for the East Bay Conservation Corps in the Summer of Service, as the co-author of the Principles for High Quality National Service Programs, and as an original member of the Training and Technical Assistance unit at the Corporation for National Service. In addition she has been a judge for the National Book Award in Poetry and the National Endowment for the Arts Prose Panel. She has consulted to foundations, colleges, and non-profits on strategic issues and fund raising, among them the Surdna Foundation, Dartmouth College, Youth Service America, and Generations United. Her articles have appeared in The New York Times Book Review and The New York Times' op-ed page, The Boston Globe Magazine, and The Chronicle of Philanthropy, among others. Most recently, she is the co-author of a critically praised work, *The Ride Together: A Brother and Sister's Memoir of Autism in the Family* (Washington Square Press, 2003). She lives with her family in Silver Spring, Maryland and Vitolini, Italy.

Irv Katz
President & CEO, National Collaboration of Youth

Mr. Katz also currently serves as President of the National Assembly of Health & Human Service Organizations, an association of seventy of the most-respected national nonprofit networks in the United States. The membership of the National Assembly ranges, alphabetically, from the Alliance for Children & Families (formerly, Family Service America) to the YWCA. The largest affinity group within the National Assembly is the National Collaboration for Youth, which Mr. Katz also serves as president and CEO. Prior to joining the National Assembly in April of 2001, he enjoyed a twenty-three year career in the United Way movement. He served in a variety of positions at United Way of Central Indiana, including six years as its president. Mostly recently, he held a senior executive position at United Way of America, with responsibility for community building, public policy, national grants and initiatives, a national mobilization for children, research, and outcome measurement. Among his achievements in the United Way movement were helping to make Youth As Resources a part of United Way of Central Indiana, establishing the Bridges to Success community-school partnership with Indianapolis Public Schools, and spreading an early child development strategy — Success By 6 — from 175 communities to over 300 communities. In his current capacity, Mr. Katz is involved in several collaborative efforts for youth, including serving on the Steering Committee of the Coalition for Community Schools and spearheading a “youth development learning network” initiative to increase access to professional development for youth workers.

Carol Kuhre
Executive Director, Rural Action

Ms. Kuhre has spent her life working with grassroots groups that are dedicated to advancing economic, social and environmental justice. She uses her training in sociology, art and theology to strengthen the voices of individuals and organizations dedicated to seeking and promoting the “common good.” As the director of Rural Action in Ohio, she has had the privilege of working with hundreds of VISTA Volunteers and scores

of other members of the AmeriCorps family. Her hobbies are hand weaving and playing the mountain dulcimer and her greatest joy is playing with her two grandchildren.

Previous to working with Rural Action, she served in Lutheran Campus Ministry at Penn State and Ohio Universities and was the Co-director of United Campus Ministry at Ohio University for close to 15 years. While in that capacity she helped to found People for Peace, Students for Peace, the Athens Coalition Against Hunger and the Appalachian Peace and Justice Network.

Ms. Kuhre has traveled with her family to many parts of the world — where she and her husband Bruce have co-lectured on American culture, art, theology and social change, feminism and art, and American low-intensity conflict. They have both been active in Philippine human rights work for two decades.

Ms. Kuhre graduated from Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota, with a B.A. in sociology, and from Ohio University with an M.A. in sociology. She also attended the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago and has studied fiber art at several universities and private institutes. Her works are held in numerous private and public collections.

Adraine LaRoza
Executive Director, ManaTeens

Ms. LaRoza is the Executive Director of the Volunteer Center of Manatee County in Bradenton, Florida. During her 10-year tenure as Director, she has served on the Points of Light Foundation National Council of Volunteer Centers and as President of the Florida Association of Volunteer Centers. She also manages The ManaTEEN Club, the nation's largest teen volunteer program, with more than 11,000 active teens volunteering 1.6 million hours of service each year in Manatee County, Florida alone.

Ms. LaRoza travels throughout the world to promote volunteerism among youth, families, adults and seniors. She assists charitable organizations across the country in fund raising, development and volunteer management.

Ms. LaRoza is a native of Huntington, West Virginia and the proud parent of two daughters who currently

serve as AmeriCorps members and a bloodhound named Albert.

Leslie Lenkowsky
CEO, Corporation for National and Community Service

The Corporation is the federal agency that oversees the Senior Corps, AmeriCorps, and Learn and Serve America programs. Appointed to that post by President George W. Bush in October 2001, Dr. Lenkowsky had been a member of the Corporation's board of directors since the agency was created in 1993.

Before joining the Bush Administration, Dr. Lenkowsky was professor of philanthropic studies and public policy at Indiana University/Purdue University at Indianapolis, as well as a research associate at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. From 1990 to 1997, he served as president of the Hudson Institute, an internationally renowned public policy research institution headquartered in Indianapolis. During Dr. Lenkowsky's tenure at Hudson, the institute developed an innovative set of programs aimed at providing practical solutions to the nation's most pressing domestic problems, such as crime, welfare dependency, and failing schools.

A leading scholar on America's civic traditions, Dr. Lenkowsky has served as president of the Institute for Educational Affairs, deputy director of the United States Information Agency, research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, adjunct faculty member at Georgetown University, and research director at the Smith Richardson Foundation. He has also served on a number of governmental, for-profit, and non-profit boards and commissions — including the Commission on National and Community Service, the predecessor agency of the Corporation — and is a fellow at the National Academy of Public Administration.

A graduate of Franklin and Marshall College, Dr. Lenkowsky received his doctorate from Harvard University. He has written extensively on a variety of public policy topics, and his writing has appeared in such publications as *Commentary*, *The Weekly Standard*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, and the *Indianapolis Business Journal*. He also has spoken frequently to educational and philanthropic groups throughout the United States.

Dr. Lenkowsky and his wife live in the Washington, D.C., area. They have two sons.

Joanna Lennon

Executive Director, East Bay Conservation Corps (EBCC)

EBCC is a nonprofit organization located in Oakland, dedicated to pioneering programs that promote the civic engagement of children and youth within the context of improving public education and strengthening the larger community. During the past two decades, the EBCC has grown to become a \$15 million agency with more than 300 staff and members serving thousands of children, youth, and families annually through four primary programs: the EBCC Charter School — both high school and elementary levels, Project YES (Youth Engaged in Service), AmeriCorps and the Institute for Citizenship Education and Teacher Preparation.

As a leader in the emergence and evolution of the urban conservation corps, service learning, and national service movements, Ms. Lennon has been outspoken in addressing the needs of children and youth through programs that allow young people to participate meaningfully in the community as they learn to be citizens. She has advised presidents George Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush, as well as members of Congress, on the potential for national service as a force for societal change. In 1984, Ms. Lennon was the founding board president for the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps (NASCC) based in Washington D.C., which provided the platform for the creation of 170 corps. In addition to her help drafting California Assembly Bill 2020 (the “Bottle Bill”) and the National Community Service Act — which Congress passed with strong bi-partisan support and President George Bush signed in 1990 — she was responsible for designing the World Conservation Strategy for the United Kingdom.

A doctoral candidate in the School of Forestry and the holder of a teaching credential from UC Berkeley, Ms. Lennon has participated in a variety of wilderness and conservation oriented activities as well as taught at the middle school, high school, and university levels. She was recently honored as the third recipient of the prestigious U.C. Berkeley’s Peter E. Haas Public Service Award.

Laura Lockwood

ManaTeens

Ms. Lockwood is the 20 year old founder of The ManaTEEN club, a program she established at the age of 12 to promote youth volunteerism in a Florida Gulf Coast community made up mostly of senior citizens. Today, The ManaTEEN club, a program of the Volunteer Services of Manatee County, Inc., is considered one of the nation’s largest teen volunteer program, with more than 11,000 teenagers (representing 80 % of the teen population in Manatee County) contributing more than 1.6 million hours of service each year to benefit 505 local organizations in the Tampa Bay community at large. Ms. Lockwood, a sophomore in college, continues her service as a second year AmeriCorps Promise Fellow, working to connect are youth with the 5 promises. She is the recipient of several national awards recognizing her service-learning advocacy, including the national NFL Community Quarterback award, and the Target National Award for service.

Catherine Milton

President, Friends of the Children

Before joining Friends, Ms. Milton was the Executive Director of US Programs and Vice President at Save the Children where she was instrumental in developing a strong domestic program that has been nationally recognized one of the best serving children living in the poorest, most underserved parts of the United States. She also developed an award-winning national mentoring campaign and several model programs for disadvantaged children and youth. Ms. Milton recently hosted President George Bush in his visit to one of Save the Children programs and also had a private meeting with the President focusing on children, volunteerism and mentoring.

For the past 15 years, Ms. Milton has been instrumental in the development of national and youth service programs. In 1992, she was appointed by President Bush as Executive Director of the federal agency, the Commission on National and Community Service and then under President Clinton as Vice President of the Corporation for National Service. In these roles, Ms. Milton was responsible for the development and the launch of the AmeriCorps program, the “domestic

Peace Corps.” Prior to her federal service, she served as Special Assistant to the President of Stanford University and as the founder and first Executive Director of the Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford University. During this period, she also helped to establish Campus Compact, a national coalition of university presidents committed to engaging students in community service. In addition, Ms. Milton has held senior positions in the Treasury Department, the US Senate and the Police Foundation. She has authored several books and co-authored six books, mostly on issues relating to the police, the role of women in the criminal justice system, and the history of Black Americans. In 1984, she was appointed to the US Attorney’s Task Force on Family Violence. In her work with the US Senate, she authored the Victims of Crime legislation which was passed into law.

Ms. Milton is currently the member of several national boards and coalitions, including Generations United and Children’s Action Alliance, and has received numerous awards, including an honorary degree from her alma mater, Mt. Holyoke College.

Vincent Pan

Executive Director, Heads Up

Mr. Pan earned his undergraduate degree from Harvard University, where he served as president of the Phillips Brooks House, the public service arm of Harvard College. In 1996, he won fellowships from the Stride Rite Foundation and Echoing Green Foundation to help found Heads Up — a citywide nonprofit organization that provides after school and summer programs for low-income children and youth while developing the leadership skills of undergraduate AmeriCorps members and tutors. Mr. Pan currently serves as the executive director of Heads Up.

In 2000, the national nonprofit Do Something awarded Mr. Pan the Brick Award for community leadership and the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post have recognized his work. Mr. Pan is a fellow with the Stanford University Center for Social Innovation and he serves a board director or advisor to several groups including the Nonprofit Roundtable of Greater Washington, Advocates for Justice and Education, and the Center for Liberal Education and Civic Engagement.

John F. Pribyl

Director, Lutheran Social Services of Minnesota

Mr. Pribyl has been a Senior Companion Director for 29 years (since July, 1974) and Foster Grandparent Director since July 1994. In that time he has developed several new demonstration ideas to further develop the role of Older Volunteers in our communities. He is a past president of the National Association of Senior Companion Program Directors, Board member of the Minnesota Gerontological Society, past member of the AAA Advisory Committee (Metro area), and a School Board member from 1994 to 1998.

He received his B.A. from St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota in 1966 and a Master of Arts degree from St. Thomas University, St. Paul, Minnesota in 1976. John’s wife Barb, is a Nurse Anesthetist working at Children’s Hospital in Minneapolis. They have three children.

Sandra Rosenblith

Senior Vice President, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)

LISC is the largest philanthropic intermediary in the nation providing support to community development corporations (CDCs) to transform distressed communities. Started in 1995, Rural LISC provides training, information, technical assistance, capacity building funding and project and venture financing to 74 Partner CDCs from 38 states, and information, education and advocacy services for nearly 1,800 rural community developers, coordinating and staffing Stand Up for Rural America, a national coalition campaign to help these groups gain the resources and policy support their work deserves. To date, Rural LISC has invested more than \$311.5 million to help Partner CDCs develop more than 9,000 affordable homes and one million square feet of essential facilities, and assist 179 small businesses, creating and retaining 2,369 jobs. Ms. Rosenblith has been with LISC since 1980. Prior to joining LISC, Ms. Rosenblith served as the Director of the Legal Division of the Office of Community Investment at the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Ms. Rosenblith is a graduate of Harvard Law School and the University of California at Berkeley. She was a founder and is a member of the Rural Funders

Working Group in the Council on Foundations, and served on its Executive Committee for its first two years (1998–2000). She is currently a board member of The Center for Rural Strategies, based in Whitesburg, KY, and the Steering Committee of Stand Up for Rural America.

Shirley Sagawa
Partner, sagawa/jospin

Ms. Sagawa has served as a presidential appointee in both the first Bush and Clinton Administrations. As Deputy Chief of Staff to First Lady Hillary Clinton, she advised the First Lady on domestic policy and led the planning for White House Conferences on Philanthropy, Partnerships in Philanthropy, and Teenagers. Ms. Sagawa was instrumental to the drafting and passage of legislation creating the Corporation for National Service. After Senate–confirmation as the Corporation’s first chief operating and policy officer, she led the development of new service programs for adults and students, including AmeriCorps, and directed strategic planning for this new government corporation.

She has also managed successful collaborations in the private sector, including the Learning First Alliance, a partnership of national education associations. With advanced degrees in law and public policy, she began her career as the Chief Counsel for Youth Policy for the Senate Labor Committee, specializing in education, children’s, and youth issues, and subsequently served as senior counsel to the National Women’s Law Center, and on many nonprofit boards, including Save the Children and the National Institute for Dispute Resolution.

Ms. Sagawa was recently named a “Woman to Watch in the 21st Century,” by Newsweek magazine, and one of the “Most Influential Working Mothers in America” by Working Mother magazine. A national expert on children’s policy and philanthropy, she has been called a “founding mother of the modern service movement” in the United States. Her book, *Common Interest, Common Good: Creating Value through Business and Social Sector Partnerships* (Harvard Business School Press) describes how business and social sector organizations can collaborate for mutual gain.

Ms. Sagawa is a graduate of Smith College, the London School of Economics and Harvard Law School, where she served on the Harvard Law Review.

Tess Scannell
Director, Senior Corps

Ms. Scannell has more than 30 years of professional experience in the fields of social services, public policy, intergenerational issues, national service, and nonprofit management.

She has served for the last two years as Director of the Senior Corps, with the Corporation for National Service, the federal agency that oversees the nation’s national service programs and previously served as Deputy Director.

From 1986 to 1995, Ms. Scannell served as the Director of Generations United, a national coalition on intergenerational issues and programs. She received her Master of Social Work from the University of Pennsylvania.

Eric Schwarz
President, Citizen Schools

As Co-Founder and President of Citizen Schools, Mr. Schwarz is responsible for overall strategic direction and leadership, new initiatives, external partnerships, and resource development. Mr. Schwarz previously served as a Public Service Fellow at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, as Executive Director of City Year Boston, and as a Vice President at City Year and the Founding Director of the City Year Serve-a-thon. Mr. Schwarz also served as National Student Director for Gary Hart’s 1984 Presidential campaign and, from 1984 through 1989, as a journalist and columnist at the Oakland Tribune and The Patriot Ledger (Quincy, MA), where he won two national awards and was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize.

Mr. Schwarz completed a Masters in Education at Harvard in June, 1997 and his undergraduate degree in history and political science at the University of Vermont in 1983. He attended a week-long non-profit leadership seminar at Harvard Business School in the summer of 1999. Mr. Schwarz has presented workshops and served on panels at conferences across the country

and serves as Co-Chair of the Board of Directors of First Night; he has also served on the boards or advisory boards of Summerbridge, The Harvard Outward Bound Project, Boston Do Something, and the City Year Serve-a-thon. He lives in Dorchester with his wife, Maureen Coffey, their young son and baby daughter.

Dorothy Stoneman
President, YouthBuild USA

YouthBuild USA is the national nonprofit intermediary and support center for more than 180 YouthBuild programs and a leader in advocating for youth engagement in civil society. Ms. Stoneman is Chairman of the YouthBuild Coalition, with 650 member organizations in 49 states. After joining the Civil Rights movement in 1964, and prior to starting YouthBuild USA in 1988, she lived and worked for 24 years in Harlem. She was first a teacher and then director of a community-based day care center, elementary school, community development housing corporation, community service program, and a youth employment and leadership development program. She was director for 10 years of the first YouthBuild program, based in East Harlem. She has built grassroots coalitions that have succeeded in obtaining hundreds of millions of dollars of city, state, and federal funds for community-based organizations to implement programs for youth and community development in low-income neighborhoods.

Ms. Stoneman is a 1996 recipient of the prestigious MacArthur “Genius” Fellowship, and was selected in 2000 by the Independent Sector as that year’s recipient of the annual John Gardner leadership award. She serves as chairman of the board of directors of Youth Action Program and Homes in East Harlem, the original YouthBuild program, and is co-chair of the Ford Foundation Leaders for a Changing World selection committee. She also serves as a member of the board of directors of Stand for Children; the board of advisors of the Forum for Youth Investment; the Harvard Saguaro Seminar on Civic Engagement convened by Professor Robert Putnam; the Levitan Youth Policy Network convened at Johns Hopkins University by Marion Pines; the international fellows of the Applied Developmental Science Institute at Tufts University chaired by Richard Lerner; and the steering committee

for the Movement to Leave No Child Behind led by Marian Wright Edelman. She is the author or editor of numerous practical handbooks regarding how to run schools and day care centers, leadership development programs for youth, and YouthBuild programs.

Ms. Stoneman has a bachelor’s degree from Harvard University in history and science; a master’s degree in early childhood education and a doctorate of humane letters from Bank Street College of Education.

Susan Stroud
Executive Director, Innovations in Civic Participation

ICP is a non-profit organization that Ms. Stroud founded to support the development of program and policy innovations in national and community service globally. Ms. Stroud also leads the policy and program development work for the Global Service Institute, an organization dedicated to increasing worldwide knowledge and understanding of service.

Ms. Stroud was a consultant to the Ford Foundation on national and community service from 1998–2001. At the Foundation, she directed a cross-program initiative to work with Foundation staff in New York and in field offices throughout the world on projects that support the role of youth in social, economic and democratic development activities.

From 1993–98 Ms. Stroud worked at the Corporation for National Service. From 1993–98, she was Senior Advisor to two CEOs of the Corporation for National Service — Eli Segal and Harris Wofford. Specific responsibilities included advising on policy issues, serving as liaison with the White House policy offices and other federal agencies. She also served as the Director of the Learn and Serve America program and Director of the Office of Domestic Policy Initiatives.

In 1993, prior to working at the Corporation, Ms. Stroud served at the White House Office of National Service as Senior Advisor to Eli Segal, Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of National Service, in the design phase of AmeriCorps and the creation of the Corporation for National Service. In this capacity she worked on policy issues, program development and as the liaison with education organizations, foundations and non-profit organizations.

Prior to working at the White House, Ms. Stroud worked at Brown University from 1978–92 as the founder and director of the Howard Swearer Center for Public Service and Assistant to the President. She also founded and directed Campus Compact, a consortium of 750 college and university presidents who share a common commitment to promoting the public purposes of higher education.

Ms. Stroud received her bachelor's degree from Duke University and a Master's degree from Leicester University in England.

Michael Tierney
Executive Director, Step by Step

Step by Step, a community non profit based on Big Ugly Creek in the coalfields of West Virginia that Mr. Tierney founded in 1988, has been Save the Children's West Virginia partner since 1998. Step by Step's core program, West Virginia Dreamers, was one of 19 models of community development recognized by the Pew Partnerships' Wanted: Solutions for America program in 2002. He has been involved with youth development programs for over 28 years since his work as a student activist in the alternative school movement in Illinois. He also founded and directed the MOSAIC community studies program at South Boston High School from 1980–86. He has been a Kellogg International Leadership Program (KILP) fellow (1995–98), the recipient of a Lyndhurst Foundation Young Career Prize (1986–88), a National Endowment For Humanities Youth Award (1982), and first came to West Virginia as a fellow with the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial in 1978. He graduated summa cum laude from Harvard University in 1981 where he started the Rural Education Apprenticeship Program and was twice cited for excellence in undergraduate teaching as an assistant to Robert Coles. He has a Masters in History of American Civilization from Brandeis University.

Rachel Tompkins
President, The Rural School and Community Trust

The Rural School and Community Trust is a national non-profit committed to enlarging student learning and

improving community life by strengthening relationships between rural schools and communities and engaging students in community-based public work. Founded as the Annenberg Rural Challenge in 1995, the Rural Trust today works with more than 700 rural elementary and secondary schools in 33 states. Through advocacy, research and outreach, the Rural Trust strives to create a more favorable policy environment for rural community perspectives on schooling, for student work with an audience and a use and for more active community participation in schooling.

Previously, Ms. Tompkins served as Extension Professor for Community, Economic, and Workforce Development in the West Virginia University Extension Service in Morgantown, West Virginia. She assisted in the creation of West Virginia Community Collaborative, Inc., a unique non-profit, public-private partnership of organizations that leads efforts to build community capacity and promote sustainable development. She served as Adviser to West Virginia Governor Gaston Caperton (1994–96), Associate Provost for Extension and Economic Development and Director of the Cooperative Extension Service at West Virginia University (1984–94), Executive Director of the Children's Defense Fund (1982–84), the premier national advocacy organization for children, and Executive Director of the Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools (1976–82).

Ms. Tompkins currently serves on the Boards of What Kids Can Do and the High Rocks Educational Corporation. She served on the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation Board of Trustees in Little Rock, Arkansas from 1994–2000 and was chair of the Board in 1999. She was the founding chair of the West Virginia Commission for National and Community Service in 1993 and continued to serve on the Commission for six years. She was Vice Chair of the Annenberg Rural Challenge from 1995–1999 and continues as an ex-officio member of the Board of the Rural School and Community Trust.

Ms. Tompkins holds degrees from West Virginia University in Biology, the Maxwell School of Syracuse University in Public Administration, and the Harvard Graduate School of Education in Administration, Planning, and Social Policy. She was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

Andrea Turner
Program Director for the Senior Companion
and Foster Grandparent Program, SCP City of
Oakland

Ms. Turner has served in this position since 1994. Prior to that, she served as a Case Manager in both the Linkages and Multipurpose Senior Services Programs. As a Doctoral student in Education and Aging, at the Western Institute for Social Research, Ms. Turner is researching social change theory.

Ms. Turner serves on several community based boards and advisory committees including A Safe Place (Battered Women's Shelter) and Seton Vietnamese Senior Services. In addition, Ms. Turner is actively involved in Vukani Mawethu, a South African choir, and produces issue centered Art Exhibits involving seniors and youth.

Juan Williams
NPR Senior Correspondent

Mr. Williams, one of America's leading journalists, is a senior correspondent for Morning Edition. He also works on documentaries and participates in NPR's efforts to explore television opportunities. Mr. Williams brings insight, depth and humor — hallmarks of NPR programs — to a wide spectrum of issues and ideas.

From 2000–2001, Mr. Williams hosted NPR's national call-in show Talk of the Nation. In that role, he brought the program to cities and towns across America for monthly radio "town hall" meetings before live audiences. The town hall meetings were a part of The Changing Face of America, a year-long NPR series focused on how Americans are dealing with rapid changes in society and culture as the United States enters the 21st century. The series, supported by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts, involves monthly pieces airing on Morning Edition and All Things Considered, as well as Talk of the Nation.

Mr. Williams is the author of the critically acclaimed biography, Thurgood Marshall — American Revolutionary, which was released in paperback in February 2000. He is also the author of the nonfiction bestseller Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years, 1954–1965.

During his 21-year career at The Washington Post, Mr. Williams served as an editorial writer, op-ed columnist, and White House reporter. He has won an Emmy award for TV documentary writing and won widespread critical acclaim for a series of documentaries including Politics – The New Black Power. Articles by Williams have appeared in magazines ranging from Newsweek, Fortune, and The Atlantic Monthly to Ebony, Gentlemen's Quarterly, and The New Republic.

Mr. Williams continues to be a contributing political analyst for the Fox News Channel and a regular panelist on Fox News Sunday. He has also appeared on numerous television programs, including Nightline, Washington Week in Review, Oprah, CNN's Crossfire (where he frequently served as co-host), and Capitol Gang Sunday.

A graduate of Haverford College, Mr. Williams received a B.A. in philosophy in 1976. Currently, he sits on a number of boards, including the Haverford College Board of Trustees, the Aspen Institute of Communications and Society Program, Washington Journalism Center, and the New York Civil Rights Coalition.

APPENDIX III

Service Program Directory

Innovations in Civic Participation compiled this program directory to highlight the programs that participated in **The Impact of National Service on Critical Social Issues: Getting Things Done**. The listings below include contact information and brief abstracts on service programs working in independent living for seniors, youth development in out of school time, and rural development. Programs were invited by ICP to send representatives to the two day event or suggested by authors commissioned to write the forum’s working papers.

Independent Living

Caring Neighbor’s Program, Lutheran Social Services61
Experience Corps/Civic Ventures61
Faith in Action Programs61
Family Friends Program, National Council on Aging61
The Foster Grandparent Program (FGP)61
Interfaith Care Partners62
Learn and Serve America62
Lutheran Social Services (LSS) of Minnesota62
ManaTeens62
National Society for American Indian Elderly (NSAIE)62
Pennsylvania’s Family Caregiver Support Program (FCSP)62
Salt Lake County Aging Services63
Senior Companion Program63
Vanderbilt University Center for Health Services63
Volunteers in Medicine Program63
Volunteers of America63

Child and Youth Development

Action for Children Today/NACCRRA (The Nation’s Network of Child Care Resources and Referrals)64
The Amachi Program64
American Youth Works64

American Youth Works64
After School Achievement Program/ Mayor’s Office, Houston, Texas64
The After School Alliance65
Alliance for Children and Families65
America’s Promise — The Alliance for Youth65
Baltimore Rising65
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America65
California Alliance for Prevention Corps (CAPC)66
Campus Compact66
Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania66
The Center for Volunteerism & National Service Programs, Frostburg State University66
Citizen Schools66
CityCares66
City Year67
Civic Works67
Community Service Volunteers (CSV)67
East Bay Conservation Corps67
Education Works — The National School and Community Corps (NSCC)67
Energy Express/West Virginia University68
Friends of the Children68
Hands on Atlanta68
Harlem Children’s Zone68
Heads Up: A University Neighborhood Initiative68

Child and Youth Development (continued)

Jumpstart	69
Latin American Youth Center (LAYC)	69
Aquaculture Course, Lubec Consolidated School, Maine	69
Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program, Inc.	69
Peace Games	69
Plus Time New Hampshire	70
Public Allies	70
National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy ..	70
Rochester AmeriCorps	70
Save the Children	70
Seniors for Schools	71
Stand for Children	71
Step by Step	71
Teach for America	71
Texas Center for Service-Learning	71
The Washington Service Corps (WSC)	71
West Virginia Dreamers	72
Yes!AmeriCorps/YMCA	72
YouthBuild U.S.A.	72
Youth Service America (YSA)	72

Rural Development

AMD & ART	72
The Serving America’s Farmworkers Everywhere (SAFE)/Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP)	73
Alateen Program/ AI-Anon	73
Community Teamwork Inc.	73
Delta Service Corps	73
Habitat for Humanity	73
Little Dixie Community Action Agency	73
Llano Grande	74
Mid South Delta LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)	74
The NORCAM Group	74
Quitman County Development Organization, INC.	74
Rural Action	74
Rural School and Community Trust	75
Southern Rural Development Center (SRDC)	75
Strengthening Alliance of Veterans and Families (SAVF)/AmeriCorps	75
Tyrell County CDC/Youth Corps Program	75

Independent Living

Caring Neighbor's Program, Lutheran Social Services (LSS) of San Diego County

29385 Rancho California Road
Temecula, CA 92591
P: (909) 691-1642
F: (909) 691-1642
www.lsssc.org/services.html

Caring Neighbors is a program linking volunteers to low income seniors and persons with disabilities. Volunteer services include minor home repair, yard work, light house-keeping, grocery shopping and escorted transportation. (See also Lutheran Social Services (LSS) of Minnesota)

Experience Corps/Civic Ventures

139 Townsend Street, Suite 505
San Francisco, CA 94107 San Francisco, CA 94107
P: (415) 430-0141
F: (415) 430-0144
Email: info@experiencecorps.org

CEO and Executive Director of Experience Corps: John Gomperts

Civic Ventures is a national nonprofit organization that works to expand the contributions of older Americans to society, and to help transform the aging of American society into a source of individual and social renewal. Civic Ventures is the central office for Experience Corps, the organization's signature program that operates in 14 cities throughout the country. Started in 1995, the program mobilizes the time, talent, and experience of adults age 55 or older in service to their communities. Experience Corps provides schools and youth-serving organizations with a critical mass of caring older adults to improve academic performance and development of young people, help schools and youth-serving organizations become more caring places, strengthen ties between these institutions and surrounding neighborhoods, and enhance the well-being of the volunteers in the process.

Faith in Action Programs

Wake Forest University School of Medicine
Medical Center Boulevard
Winston-Salem, NC 27157-1204
P: (877) 324-8411 (toll-free) or 336-716-0101
F: 336-716-3346
Email: info@fiavolunteers.org
www.fiavolunteers.org/what/index.cfm

Faith in Action is an interfaith volunteer caregiving program of The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Faith in Action makes grants to local groups from churches, synagogues, mosques and other houses of worship, and throughout the community at large. Volunteers help members of the community with long-term health needs to maintain their independence for as long as possible. In 2001, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation committed \$100 million to expand the Faith in Action national movement.

Family Friends Program, National Council on Aging

NCOA, 300 D Street SW, Suite 801
Washington, DC 20024
P: (202) 479-6675
F: (202) 479-6664
www.family-friends.org/index.htm

Family Friends Program matches older volunteers with at-risk children and families.

Projects address children with disabilities or chronic illness, abused and neglected children, and children in foster care. The volunteers support families in crisis by caring, listening, and providing practical assistance to meet the demands of daily living.

The Foster Grandparent Program (FGP)

Senior Corps
Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
P: (800) 424-8867
www.seniorcorps.org/joining/fgp

FGP is part of Senior Corps, a network of national service programs that provide older Americans the opportunity to put their life experiences to work for local communities. Foster Grandparents serve as mentors, tutors, and caregivers for at-risk children and youth with special needs through a variety of community organizations, including schools, hospitals, drug treatment facilities, correctional institutions, and Head Start and day-care centers. The Foster Grandparent Program is open to people age 60 and over with limited incomes; Foster Grandparents serve 20 hours a week.

Interfaith Care Partners

701 N. Post Oak Rd, Suite 330
Houston, TX 77024
P: (713) 682-5995
F: (713) 682-0639
Email: info@interfaithcarepartners.org
www.interfaithcarepartners.org

Interfaith Care Partners volunteers provide in-home assistance to people with special health-related needs, including disabled patients, and those with Alzheimer's disease and AIDS. In 1998, the program received a President's Service Award in recognition of its national leadership and record of community service.

Learn and Serve America

Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
P: (202) 606-5000, x484
F: (202) 565-2787
Email: acohen@cns.gov
www.learnandserve.org

Director: Amy Cohen

Learn and Serve America is one of the three programs administered by The Corporation for National and Community Service. The program provides grants to schools, colleges, and nonprofit groups to support efforts to engage students in community service linked to academic achievement and the development of civic skills. This type of learning, called service learning, improves communities while preparing young people for a lifetime of responsible citizenship. In addition to providing grants, Learn and Serve America serves as a resource on service and service-learning to teachers, faculty members, schools, and community groups.

Lutheran Social Services (LSS) of Minnesota

2485 Como Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
P: (651)642-5990
F: (651)969-2360
www.lssmn.org/default.htm

LSS is the largest statewide non-profit social service agency in Minnesota, with over 2,000 employees who serve in 200 communities. It is operated by the Minnesota branch of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA). Services sponsored by LSSMN focus on children and youth, families and adults, seniors, and people with disabilities. Service

programs for seniors include Foster Grandparents, through which a senior can help children by offering friendship and tutorial services in schools and community centers, and Senior Companions, through which seniors can help other seniors by assisting with tasks such as shopping, minor chores and errands.

ManaTeens

5131 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, FL 34209
P: (941) 761-320
F: (941) 761-0458
E-mail: manateens@aol.com
www.manateens.org

The ManaTEEN Club was organized in 1994, to promote youth volunteerism and to assist students in fulfilling classroom and/or college scholarship requirements. The club has grown from 22 charter members to more than 10,000 enrolled teens. ManaTEENS works with 550 nonprofit organizations, communities of faith and schools in southwestern Florida, and donates over one million hours of service annually.

National Society for American Indian Elderly (NSAIE)

2214 North Central, Suite 250
Phoenix, Arizona, 85004
P: (602) 307-1865
Email: info@nsaie.org
www.nsaie.org

NSAIE was founded in 1987 by a consortium of American Indian individuals who provided service to the elderly living on tribal lands. The mission of NSAIE is to improve the quality of life for on-reservation American Indian senior citizens by supporting a network of tribally established and administered services and small grants to tribal senior centers for community health services such as nutrition and in-home services.

Pennsylvania's Family Caregiver Support Program (FCSP) double check

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Aging
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1919
P: (717) 783-1550
F: (717) 783-6842
caregiverpa.psu.edu/manual/text/s4-04-family.htm

FCSP is administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Aging, through the local Area Agencies on Aging. The Program was established to reduce family caregiver stress and burden by reinforcing the care being provided to persons 60 or over residing with the primary family caregiver. FCSP offers many components of care-giving assistance, including assessment of needs and development of a care plan, benefits and community resource counseling, caregiver education and support; and financial assistance in purchasing caregiving related goods and services.

Salt Lake County Aging Services

2001 South State Street, S1500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84190-2300
P: (801) 468-2454
www.slcoagingservices.org

Department Director: Shauna O'Neil

The Division of Aging Services is responsible for providing programs and services on behalf of the 97,293 residents of Salt Lake County who are age 60 and over, and their caregivers. SLCAS provides in-home services to medically frail adults, organizes classes under the Healthy Aging Program, and provides chore services such as lawn mowing, yard clean-up, and snow shoveling.

Senior Companion Program

Senior Corps
Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
P: 800-424-8867
www.seniorcorps.org/joining/scp

Part of Senior Corps, the Program is a network of national service programs that provides older Americans with the opportunity to apply their life experiences to meeting community needs. Senior Companions serve one-on-one with the frail elderly and other homebound persons who have difficulty completing everyday tasks. They assist with grocery shopping, bill paying, and transportation to medical appointments, and they alert doctors and family members to potential problems. Senior Companions also provide short periods of relief to primary caregivers.

Vanderbilt University Center for Health Services

Vanderbilt University
2201 West End Avenue
Nashville, Tennessee 37235
Email: barbara.m.clinton@vanderbilt.edu
www.mc.vanderbilt.edu/root/vumc.php?site=chs

Director: Barbara Clinton

The Center is a group of community service projects whose goal is to support people working at the grassroots level to take control of their physical, social, political, and environmental health. The four main projects within the Center are the Student Health Coalition, the Maternal and Infant Health Outreach Worker Program (MIHOW), Service Training for Environmental Progress Project (STEP), and Community Scholars.

Volunteers in Medicine Program

The Volunteers in Medicine Institute
162 St. Paul Street - side
Burlington, VT 05401
P: (802)651-0112
F: (802)651-0599
E-mail: VIM.Institute@verizon.net
www.vimi.org/index.htm

Chairman: Hugh Greeley

The Volunteers in Medicine Program seeks to promote and guide the development of a national network of free clinics emphasizing the use of retired medical and lay volunteers to care for the "working uninsured" within a culture of caring so that everyone in a community has access to health care. The Program is run by Volunteers in Medicine Institute.

Volunteers of America

1660 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-3421
P: (703) 341-5000
F: (703) 341-7000
Email: voa@voa.org
<http://www.volunteersofamerica.org/>

Volunteers of America is a national, nonprofit, spiritually based organization providing local human service programs, and opportunities for individual and community involvement. From rural America to inner-city neighborhoods, Volunteers of America provides outreach programs that deal with today's most pressing social needs. Volunteers of America helps at-risk youth, frail elderly, abused and neglected children, people with disabilities, homeless individuals and many others.

Child and Youth Development

Action for Children Today/NACCRRA (The Nation's Network of Child Care Resources and Referrals)

1319 F Street NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20004
P: (202) 393-5501
F: (202) 393-1144
Email: act@naccrra.org
www.naccrra.org/act/index.htm

NACCRRA's mission is to provide vision, leadership, and support to community child care resource and referral and to promote national policies and partnerships committed to the development and learning of all children. The Action for Children Today Project (ACT), an NACCRRA initiative engages AmeriCorps members to improve the quality and availability of infant, toddler, pre-school and school-age care in local communities and to help connect families with other needed services.

The Amachi Program

Proclamation Presbyterian Church
278 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010
P: (610) 520-9500
F: (610) 520-5240
Email info@proclamation.org
www.proclamation.org/amachi.html

Senior Program Officer (Public/Private Ventures):
Terry Cooper

Amachi is a mentoring program that connects children of incarcerated adults with volunteer mentors recruited through congregations. The Amachi program relies on a partnership of secular and faith-based institutions in Philadelphia, which includes local congregations, Public/Private Ventures, Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, and the Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society at the University of Pennsylvania.

American Youth Works

216 E. 4th Street
Austin, TX 78701
P: (512) 472-8220
F: (512) 472-1189
Email: moreinfo@ail.org
www.ail.org/ayw.html

American YouthWorks (AYW) helps youth and adults complete their education, prepare for employment, and improve their life skills through employment training, counseling services, and youth corps programs. AYW engages participants in determining what services will be offered and provides opportunities for them to give back to their community, while providing the support services that will ensure their success.

A STAR

Braddock House
101 Braddock Road
Frostburg, MD 21532
P: (301) 687-7615
F: (301) 687-1041
Email: sking@frostburg.edu

Director: Sean King

A STAR is a collaboration of 20 service sites and other community organizations that is helping to address the challenges facing the Western Maryland area. A STAR has recruited and graduated 244 AmeriCorps members who have served in the public schools, provided after-school and other support services to those needing access to food, clothing, and shelter, helped those requiring independent living assistance receive the necessary services, and promoted safe, healthy and sustainable forms of land use, including alternative agriculture and outdoor recreation programs.

After School Achievement Program/Mayor's Office, Houston, Texas

P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251
P: (713) 247-1836
Email: cheryl.murray@cityofhouston.net
www.ci.houston.tx.us/opsdp/afterschool.htm

The After School Achievement Program is the result of a partnership between the Mayor's Office of Houston, Texas, and the Joint City/County Commission on Children. The After-School Initiative is a community-based, collaborative effort that offers children constructive and positive activities between the hours of 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. There are currently 68 program sites, including 50 school-based sites and 18 non-profit community sites. The initiative includes four areas of emphasis: academic enhancement, personal skills development, enrichment activities and community involvement.

The After School Alliance

1616 H St., NW
 Washington, DC 20006
 P: (202) 296-9378
 Email: info@afterschoolalliance.org
www.afterschoolalliance.org

The Afterschool Alliance is a nonprofit organization dedicated to raising awareness of the importance of afterschool programs and advocating for quality, affordable programs for all children. It serves as a voice for afterschool through researching, collecting, and disseminating key data and lessons learned; educating the public through ongoing awareness efforts; engaging local practitioners and community residents in outreach and advocacy; and promoting investment in afterschool initiatives at the national, state, and local levels. The Alliance is supported by a group of public, private and nonprofit organizations that share the its vision of ensuring that all children have access to afterschool programs by 2010.

Alliance for Children and Families

1319 F Street, NW
 Suite 400
 Washington, DC 20004
 P: (202) 313-3570
 F: (202) 393-3571
 Email: njean@alliance1.org
www.alliance1.org

The Alliance for Children and Families is a national voluntary association of nonprofit, community-based human service organizations, which serve millions of people in thousands of communities every year. Motivated by a vision of a healthy society and strong communities for all children and families, the Alliance's mission is to strengthen its members' capacity to serve and advocate for children, families and communities.

America's Promise — The Alliance for Youth

909 N. Washington St., Suite 400
 Alexandria, VA 22314
 P: 1-800-365-0153
 F: (703) 535-3900
 Email: commit@americaspromise.org
www.americaspromise.org/index.cfm

President and CEO: Peter A. Gallagher

America's Promise was founded after the Presidents' Summit for America's Future, April 27-28, 1997, in Philadelphia. Presidents Clinton, Bush, Carter, and Ford, with First Lady Nancy Reagan representing her husband, challenged the

nation to make youth a national priority. Their call to action included a commitment on the part of the nation to fulfill the Five Promises: Caring Adults, Safe Places, Healthy Start, Marketable Skills and Opportunities to Serve. America's Promise has created a diverse and growing Alliance of more than 400 national "Partner" organizations, who make large-scale national commitments to fulfill one or more of the Five Promises. More than 400 local efforts involving community and state partners across the nation have also united to fulfill the Five Promises.

Baltimore Rising

Mayor's Office for Children, Youth and Families
 10 South Street, Suite 600
 Baltimore, Maryland 21202
 P: (410) 396-4274
 F: (410) 396-8137
 Email: jmoses@mocyf-balt.org
www.ci.baltimore.md.us/government/mocyf/

Executive Director: Jamaal Moses

Baltimore Rising is a mentoring initiative modeled on successful community-driven, faith-based youth violence reduction initiatives in Philadelphia and Boston. The mentoring initiative connects 300 faith-motivated mentors with at-risk youths who live in their community. The program is complemented by a monitoring initiative, which teams a youth worker and juvenile justice probation officer to focus on reconnecting with society the 300 teenagers most likely to engage in criminal, delinquent and violent behavior.

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America

10210 Greenbelt Road, Suite 900
 Lanham, MD 20706
 P: (301) 794-9170
<http://www.bbbsa.org/index.asp>

"Big Brothers and Big Sisters are, foremost, friends to children: They share everyday activities, expand horizons, and experience the joy in even the simplest events. Within those little moments lies the big magic that a Big Brother or Big Sister brings to the life of a young person." Today, Big Brothers Big Sisters serves hundreds of thousands of children in 5,000 communities across the country. The goal is to provide "Bigs" to 400,000 children by 2004, the year of BBBS's 100th anniversary, and to one million children by 2010.

California Alliance for Prevention Corps (CAPC)

Prevent Child Abuse California
 926 J Street, Suite 717
 Sacramento, CA 95814
www.pca-ca.org/statewideinitiative.htm

CAPC is a statewide initiative through which AmeriCorps members enhance child abuse prevention efforts in local communities. The goals of CAPC are to influence public policy and practice via education, government action and advocacy; to proliferate public awareness, breakthrough programs and practices; to educate and train in the field of child abuse prevention; and to facilitate and strengthen local organizations and resources.

Campus Compact

Box 1975
 Brown University
 Providence, RI 02912-1975
 P: (401) 867-3950
 F: (401) 867-3925
 Email: campus@compact.org
www.compact.org/aboutcc/

Executive Director: Elizabeth Hollander

Campus Compact is a national coalition of approximately 850 college and university presidents committed to the civic purposes of higher education. To support this civic mission, Campus Compact promotes community service that develops students' citizenship skills and values, encourages partnerships between campuses and communities, and assists faculty who seek to integrate public and community engagement into their teaching and research.

**Center for Community Partnerships,
University of Pennsylvania**

133 South 36th Street, Suite 519
 Philadelphia, PA 19104-3246
 P: (215) 898-5351
 F: (215) 573-2799
 Email: harkavy@pobox.upenn.edu
www.upenn.edu/ccp

Director: Ira Harkavy

Founded in 1992, the Center for Community Partnerships is a university-wide initiative which strives to improve the internal coordination and collaboration of all university-wide community service programs, to create new and effective partnerships between the University and the community, and to encourage new and creative initiatives linking Penn and

the community. The Center also seeks to create and strengthen local, national and international networks of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities.

The Center for Volunteerism & National Service Programs, Frostburg State University

Frostburg State University
 Braddock House
 101 Braddock Road
 Frostburg, MD 21532
 P: (301) 687-4210
 F: (301) 687-1041
 Email: ckrug@frostburg.edu

Executive Director: Cherie Krug

The Center sponsors numerous programs to engage students and student clubs and organizations in volunteerism and national service programs, including V.O.I.C.E. a volunteer clearinghouse, environmental programs, FSU Alternative Break and National Volunteer Week.

Citizen Schools

308 Congress Street
 (Children's Museum building)
 5th Floor
 Boston, MA 02210
 P: (617) 695-2300
 F: (617) 695-2367
www.citizenschools.org

President: Eric Schwarz

Citizen Schools offers after-school and summer programs for children 9-14 in Boston and across the U.S. Through "apprenticeships" with local experts, children learn real-world skills, build self-confidence, and connect with their communities.

CityCares

1605 Peachtree Str.
 Atlanta, GA 30309
 P: (404) 879-2755
 F: (404) 253-1020
 Email: info@citycares.org
www.citycares.org

President: Michelle Nunn

CityCares was formed in 1992 to serve as the umbrella organization for local CityCares organizations known as "Cares" or "Hands On" organizations (see Hands on Atlanta).

These organizations engage over 250,000 volunteers in direct service to their communities each year. In cities large and small, 30 Cares affiliates have been established in the U.S., one affiliate in the Philippines, and an additional 13 partner organizations in the U.K. The primary mission of CityCares is to support and strengthen the existing CityCares network, while fostering the development of new CityCares organizations.

City Year

5440 31st Street, NW
Washington, DC
P: (202) 776-7780
F: (202) 776-7788
Email: aconnolly@cityyear.org
www.cityyear.org/

Vice President & Chief of Staff: AnnMaura Connolly

City Year is an “action tank” for national service, constantly combining theory and practice to advance new policy ideas, make programmatic breakthroughs, and bring about major changes in society. City Year seeks to demonstrate, improve and promote the concept of national service as a means for building a stronger democracy.

Civic Works

2701 St. Lo Drive
Baltimore, MD 21213
P: (410) 366-8533
F: (410) 366-1831
Email: dstein@civicworks.com
www.civicworks.com/index.html

President/Executive Director: Dana M. Stein

Founded in 1993, Civic Works is Baltimore’s non-profit youth service corps. Corpsmembers, aged 17–25, improve the lives of thousands of Baltimore residents by transforming abandoned lots into parks and gardens, boarding up and cleaning vacant houses, leading neighborhood clean-up efforts throughout Baltimore, and tutoring and mentoring elementary school children in after-school programs. Corpsmembers work in teams under the direction of skilled supervisors who help them to develop community problem-solving skills and a positive work ethic.

Community Service Volunteers (CSV)

237 Pentonville Road
London N1 9NJ
United Kingdom
P: 0044 20 7643 1402
Email: information@csv.org.uk
www.csv.org.uk

Executive Director: Elisabeth Hoodless

CSV is a national voluntary organization and registered charity. Founded in 1962, it began life as a national volunteer agency. Over the years, CSV’s work has developed and diversified considerably and it now works in such fields as youth volunteering, senior volunteering, and service learning. The CSV Volunteer Program challenges every young person aged 16 to 35 to volunteer for up to twelve months, mostly away from home. CSV volunteers bring energy and enthusiasm to their work with older people, young offenders, homeless people, and people with learning disabilities or mental illness.

East Bay Conservation Corps

1021 Third Street
Oakland, CA 94607
P: (510) 992-7800
F: (510) 992-7950
Email: info@ebcc-school.org

President: Stephen Davenport

Founded in 1983, the East Bay Conservation Corps (EBCC) was one of the first in an emerging national movement of urban community service organizations for youth and young adults. Dedicated to promoting youth development through environmental stewardship and community service, the EBCC has been in the forefront of service-learning programs and curriculum development. Its major priority is to help youth in improving the East Bay. The program hires and trains young adults, 18–24, to work on public lands in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. The program runs 5 days, 40 hours per week. Corpsmembers are paid 32 hours of work per week; the other 8 hours are for education.

Education Works — The National School and Community Corps (NSCC)

Education Works
684 Whitehead Road
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648
P: (609) 392-6662
F: (609) 392-6211
Email: NCSS@educationworks-online.org
www.educationworks-online.org/index.htm

Executive Director: Martin Friedman

NSCC, an AmeriCorps national service program, is a dynamic part of school restructuring which joins national service with urban school reform. It brings a vision, activities, services, and resources to schools and neighborhoods. NSCC members enrich the school environment and extend the school day, week and year to benefit students, their parents, and the community as a whole.

Energy Express/West Virginia University

Energy Express, West Virginia University
Allen Hall 706
PO Box 6602
Morgantown, WV, 26506
P: (304) 293-3855
Email: rphillip@wvu.edu

Director: Ruthellen H. Phillips

Developed and coordinated by the West Virginia University Extension Service, Energy Express is an innovative six-week summer program that promotes the academic success of elementary school children living in rural and low-income communities. Children are immersed in “print-rich” activities, such as writing their own stories and creating artwork and puppet plays to depict the books they read. AmeriCorps college-student mentors help the children enjoy the summer reading programs.

Friends of the Children

Friends of the Children — National
44 N.E. Morris
Portland, OR 97212-3015
P: (503) 281-6633 x126
F: (503) 281-6819
Email: cmilton@Friendstochildren.org
www.friendsofthechildren.com/index.htm

President: Catherine Milton

Friends was founded in Portland, Oregon in 1993 after almost two years of research and benchmarking concluded that the single most important protective factor in a child’s life is a relationship with a supportive, caring adult. Friends of the Children is the only program in the country that provides highly trained, full-time, professional mentors to “high risk” youth for 12 years starting in first grade. Friends provides that relationship to those children who are most in danger of school failure, abuse, neglect, juvenile delinquency, gang and drug involvement, and teenage pregnancy. Today, Friends serves children in 11 cities across the United States.

Hands on Atlanta

1605 Peachtree Str.
Atlanta, GA 30309
P: (404) 872-2252
F: (404) 872-2251
Email: info@HandsOnAtlanta.com
www.handsonatlanta.org

Executive Director: Michelle Nunn

Hands On Atlanta is a non-profit organization that helps individuals, families and corporate and community groups find flexible volunteer opportunities at more than 400 service organizations and schools. Hands On Atlanta volunteers, now 25,000 strong, are at work every day of the year building communities and meeting critical needs in schools, parks, senior homes, food banks, pet shelters, low-income neighborhoods and more. Hands On Atlanta is an affiliate of CityCares (see above), an umbrella association of “Cares” and “Hands On” organizations across the United States, U.K. and other countries.

Harlem Children’s Zone

1916 Park Ave., Suite 212
New York, NY 10037
P: (212)234-6200
F: (212)234-2340
Email: info@harlemchildrenszone.org
www.hcz.org

Chief Operating Officer: George Khaldun

Founded in 1970, Harlem Children’s Zone, Inc. is a pioneering, non-profit, community-based organization that works to enhance the quality of life for children and families in some of New York City’s most devastated neighborhoods. The emphasis of its work is not just on education, social service and recreation, but on “rebuilding the very fabric of community life”. HCZ Inc.’s 15 centers serve more than 12,600 children and adults, including over 7,500 at-risk children. HCZ Inc. intentionally develops programs where other agencies are not located and poor children and families have no other resources available.

Heads Up: A University Neighborhood Initiative

645 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE,
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20003
P: (202) 544-4468
F: (202) 544-4437
Email: info@heads-up-dc.org

www.headsup-dc.org/about.html

Co-founder and Executive Director: Vincent Pan

Founded in 1996, Heads Up is a non-profit organization that runs education and enrichment programs for children and families living in the most under-resourced parts of Washington, D.C. A unique type of organization, Heads Up draws particularly on the untapped potential of the city's college students as its tutors, teachers, and mentors. At the same time, Heads Up helps these college students understand their social responsibilities and trains them in the leadership skills to carry them out. Today, the efforts of Heads Up include daily after-school and summer programs for elementary school students, weekly college and job readiness activities for teenagers, and a service-learning curriculum for college students.

Jumpstart

93 Summer Street
2nd Floor
Boston, MA 02110
P: (617) 542-5867
Email: martha_mason@jstart.org
www.jstart.org

Executive Assistant: Martha Mason

Jumpstart was founded in 1994 at the intersection of two national trends: a public need for quality early childhood programs, and the emerging national service movement recruiting thousands of college students to community service. Jumpstart connects these trends by recruiting, training, supervising, and supporting college students to work with Head Start and other early childhood programs to provide one-to-one attention to young children struggling in preschool. Jumpstart offers both summer and school year programs for children.

Latin American Youth Center (LAYC)

1419 Columbia Road, NW
Washington, DC 20009
P: (202) 319-2225
F: (202) 462-5696
Email: info@mail.layc-dc.org
www.layc-dc.org/

LAYC is a non-profit youth and family center in Washington, D.C. Founded in 1974 for the purpose of serving at-risk immigrant Latino youth, LAYC now works each year with over 5,000 infants, children, teens, and adults from the city's Latino, Vietnamese, Caribbean, African-American, and African

communities. Within its multi-lingual and multi-cultural environment, LAYC strives to counteract the effects of poverty and racism. LAYC programs help youth develop critical thinking and leadership skills and, through the visual and performing arts specially, address cultural differences and difficult social issues.

Aquaculture Course, Lubec Consolidated School, Maine

20 South Street
Lubec, ME 04652

Teacher: Brian Leavitt

Through this high school vocational program students raise fresh water fish as a community economic development project.

Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program, Inc.

403 Markland Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21212
P: (410) 532-6864
F: (410) 532-2418
Email: natloffice@ndmva.org
www.ndmva.org

Executive Director: Ms. Katherine Corr

The Notre Dame Mission Volunteers, Inc., is a non-profit organization founded by the Sisters of Notre Dame, a religious institution which has been serving communities in need for over 150 years. Among other social issues which the organization addresses, the Notre Dame volunteers target the educational needs of the disadvantaged youth and their families. AmeriCorps members tutor low-income children, teach ESL to immigrants and GED and literacy skills to adults such as single mothers and high school drop-outs, and lead after school programs. Members also recruit volunteer parents for enrichment programs, teach conflict resolution skills, and provide school-to-work transition support for migrant farm workers.

Peace Games

Peace Games National Office
285 Dorchester Avenue
Boston, MA 02127
P: (617) 464-2600
F: (617) 464-1174
Email: info@peacegames.org
www.peacegames.org

Since its founding in 1996, Peace Games has grown to be an entrepreneurial national non-profit and a proud member of the AmeriCorps national service network that is poised for growth. It is an innovative violence prevention program that teaches elementary school children across the country to be peacemakers. Peace Games seeks to empower children so that they may create their own safe classrooms and communities.

Plus Time New Hampshire

160 Dover Road Suite 1

Chichester, NH 03258

P: (603) 798-5850

F: (603) 798-5861

Email: info@plustime.org

www.plustime.org

PlusTime New Hampshire is a non-profit organization which provides advocacy and technical support to enable youth to participate in positive, safe out-of-school time programs and experiences. . By providing direct support, training, information, and funding assistance, PlusTime NH is able to help communities throughout the state identify the needs of youth and mobilize local resources to develop and sustain appropriate out-of-school time programs. PlusTime NH also supports existing youth programs through training, consultation, and funding.

Public Allies

Public Allies, Inc.

1120 Connecticut Ave. Suite 435

Washington, DC 20036

P: (202) 293-3969

F: (202) 822-1196

Email: info@publicallies.org

www.publicallies.org

Public Allies selects promising young leaders who commit to a ten-month program of full-time, paid apprenticeships in community organizations, team service projects, and weekly leadership training. Public Allies also includes activities for alumni, such as a private online network with an “action” section that permits people to organize on public issues by issue-area interests and location.

National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy

1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 200

Washington, DC 20036

P: (202) 478-8554

F: (202) 478-8588

Email: campaign@teenpregnancy.org

www.teenpregnancy.org/Default.asp?bhcp=1

Director: Sarah S. Brown

The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, founded in February 1996, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan initiative supported almost entirely by private donations. Its mission is to improve the well-being of children, youth, and families by reducing teen pregnancy. The Campaign’s goal is to reduce the teen pregnancy rate by one-third between 1996 and 2005. To reduce teenage pregnancy, the Campaign provides a national presence and leadership to raise awareness of the issue and to attract new voices and resources to the cause. It provides concrete assistance to those already working in the field. The Campaign runs two programs that involve service learning, Reach for Health Community Youth Service Learning and Teen Outreach Program.

Rochester AmeriCorps

Damon City Campus

Monroe Community College

228 East Main Street, Room 4081

Rochester, New York 14604

P: (585) 262-1778

Email: mrosche@monroecc.edu

www.monroecc.edu/depts/ameriCorps

Director: Marilyn Rosche

Each year, Rochester AmeriCorps enrolls approximately 100 members who are placed at a variety of community, city and county organizations. The program’s mission is to mobilize its members and neighborhood residents to improve the reality and perception of public safety in Rochester’s highest need neighborhoods, with an emphasis on community based initiatives involving children and youth.

Save the Children

54 Wilton Road

Westport, CT 06880

P: (203) 221-4030

www.savethechildren.org

President, CEO: Charles MacCormack

Save the Children works in the poorest communities partnering with existing community-based organizations to help develop the local capacity to plan, develop, manage and sustain out-of-school time programs for young people. Save the Children also connects community partners to a national network of resources. These include support and gifts-in-kind from Save the Children’s corporate and private donors, and government initiatives like the Corporation for National and

Community Service's AmeriCorps, VISTA, and the Foster Grandparent programs. Save the Children addresses these issues through its Web of Support programs. Web of Support is a successful community partnership approach that provides children with caring adults, safe places and constructive activities during their out-of-school time in the areas of health, education and economic opportunity.

Seniors for Schools

Senior Corps
Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
www.seniorcorps.org/joining/seniors4schools.html

A Senior Corps demonstration program developed as part of America Reads, the Seniors for Schools program, recruits, trains, and supervises adults over the age of 55 to help children read. In the program's first three years, the seniors tripled the number of students receiving help, from 1,642 to 5,462 children. In the same period, the program doubled the number of its volunteers and the number of schools served.

Stand for Children

1420 Columbia Road, NW, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20009
P: 1-800-663-4032
F: (202) 234-0391
E-mail: tellstand@stand.org
www.stand.org/aboutus/index.html

Executive Director: Jonah Edelman

Stand for Children's goal is to ensure that all children have a chance to grow up healthy, educated, and safe. In pursuit of this vision, Stand for Children Chapters have taken actions that have helped more than 227,000 children. In so doing, Chapters have secured more than \$138 million for children's programs and services.

Step by Step

659 Big Ugly Creek Road, East
Harts, WV 25524
P: (304) 414-4452
F: (304) 414-4410
Email: stepbystep@wvdreamers.org
www.wvdreamers.org/defaultold.htm

Step by Step is a community education program based on Big Ugly Creek in southern Lincoln County, West Virginia. Step by Step's programs include work in youth leadership, family

advocacy, and community development, including technology, teen jobs programs and arts and humanities. (Also see West Virginia Dreamers)

Teach for America

315 West 36th Street
New York, NY 10018
P: (212) 279-2080
F: (212) 279-2081
www.teachforamerica.org

Founder and President: Wendy Copp

Teach For America is the national corps of outstanding college graduates of all academic majors and backgrounds who commit two years to teach in urban and rural public schools and become lifelong leaders in the effort to ensure that all children in the nation have an equal chance in life. Teach For America places teachers in eighteen locations across the country. Since its inception in 1990, approximately 9,000 exceptional individuals have joined Teach For America, directly impacting the lives of more than 1.25 million students, and taking on leadership roles as alumni to increase opportunity for children.

Texas Center for Service-Learning

2538 S. Congress Ave,
Suite 300
Austin, TX, 78704
P: (512) 441-1147 (ext. 101)
F: (512) 441-1181
Email: jspence@esc14.net
www.txcs.org

Director: John Spence

The Texas Center for Service-Learning seeks to improve student achievement through service-learning. The Center assists students, teachers, administrators and communities in Texas and the Southwest Region with training, technical assistance and resources to develop and strengthen service-learning.

The Washington Service Corps (WSC)

P.O. Box 9046
Olympia, WA 98507-9046
P: 1-888-713-6080
Email: wsc@esd.wa.gov
www.wa.gov/esd/wsc

The Washington Service Corps (WSC) was created by the state legislature in 1983 to provide young adults with

opportunities to serve their communities. The oldest publicly-funded state-wide service program in the nation, WSC has challenged thousands of young adults with hundreds of opportunities to get things done by addressing critical needs in their local communities. Administered by the Employment Security Department, the WSC assists private non-profit organizations and units of local government in addressing unmet community needs and providing young adults with meaningful service experiences.

West Virginia Dreamers

659 Big Ugly Creek Road, East
Harts, WV 25524
P: (304) 414-4452
F: (304) 414-4410
Email: stepbystep@wvdreamers.org
www.wvdreamers.org/defaultold.htm

West Virginia Dreamers is an innovative afterschool and summer program in which the young people declare one dream each year that they want to pursue, and program coordinators work with each child to help turn this dream into reality. Whether their goal is to make the world's biggest pancake, to take fiddle lessons, go white water rafting or act in a play, children stretch themselves and their families. The program design is unique; children stay in the program until they graduate from high school, while a core group of adults make a long-term commitment to work with the children, providing continuity and reinforcement of learned skills.

Yes!AmeriCorps/YMCA

833 Howard Ave., Suite 300
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113
P: (504) 566-7323
F: (504) 568-1938
Email: yes@ymcaneworleans.org
www.ymcaneworleans.org/yes/ameri-corps.htm

AmeriCorps members working through this program tutor after-school at Hispanic apartment complexes, visit with the children's families in their apartments, and help the community identify its own needs and develop its own leaders.

YouthBuild U.S.A.

58 Day Street
P.O. Box 440322
Somerville, MA 02144
P: (617) 623-9900
F: (617) 623-4359
Email: ybinfo@youthbuild.org

www.youthbuild.org/about.html

Founder and President: Dorothy Stoneman

YouthBuild is a comprehensive youth and community development program as well as an alternative school. Designed to run on a 12-month cycle, YouthBuild offers job training, education, counseling, and leadership development opportunities to unemployed and out-of-school young adults, ages 16-24, through the construction and rehabilitation of affordable housing in their own communities.

Youth Service America (YSA)

1101 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 200

Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 296-2992
F: (202) 296-4030
www.ysa.org/index.cfm

President & Chief Executive Officer: Steven Culbertson

YSA is a resource center and premier alliance of 300+ organizations committed to increasing the quantity and quality of opportunities for young Americans to serve locally, nationally, or globally. Founded in 1986, YSA's mission is to strengthen the effectiveness, sustainability, and scale of the youth service and service-learning fields. YSA envisions a powerful network of organizations committed to making service the common expectation and common experience of all young Americans.

Rural Development

AMD & ART

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
South Interior Building
1951 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240
P: (202) 208-2836
Email: tcomp@osmre.gov
www.amdandart.org

Founder: T. Allan Comp, Ph.D.

Abandoned mine drainage (AMD) is a devastating environmental problem and a significant economic and social constraint. AMD&ART, a nonprofit organization located in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, is trying to address this problem through a holistic, collaborative and interdisciplinary approach that integrates AMD remediation with economic development and community renewal. AMD&ART's pilot project in

Vintondale, Pennsylvania, was conceived as a large-scale artful and educational public place that would draw attention to the problem of AMD, at the same time bringing new life to abandoned mine lands. This approach has provided an arena large enough to support the interests and concerns of the community by turning aerators into fountains, limestone ditches into waterways, settlement cells into ponds and wetlands, and industrial sites into historical “ghosts” that invite reflection.

The Serving America’s Farmworkers Everywhere (SAFE)/Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP)

4350 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 410
Arlington, VA 22203
P: (703) 528-4141
F: (703) 528-4145
Email: wochinske@afop.org
www.afop.org/frames.html

The AFOP mission is to improve the quality of life for migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families by providing advocacy for the member organizations that serve them.

Through the SAFE Program, AmeriCorps volunteers assist farmworkers and their families by teaching them about pesticide safety and health risks in the fields.

Alateen Program/ Al-Anon

1475 Westfield
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
P/F: (734) 995-4949

The Al-Anon Family Groups are a fellowship of relatives and friends of alcoholics who share their experience, strength, and hope, in order to solve their common problems. Alateen is a fellowship of young Al-Anon members, usually teenagers, whose lives have been affected by someone else’s drinking. Alateen members organize self-help groups in order to share experiences, strength and hope with each other, to discuss their difficulties, and to learn effective ways to cope with their problems.

Community Teamwork Inc.

167 Dutton
St. Lowell, MA 01852
<http://www.comteam.org/>

Community Teamwork, Inc is Greater Lowell’s Community Action Agency. It is committed to mobilizing resources for low-income people to become self-sufficient, to participate in

decisions that affect their lives, and to alleviate the effects of poverty. Among its multiple services are Senior Companion Program and Youth Build.

Delta Service Corps

780 N. Airport Road
P.O. Box 2990
West Memphis, AR 72303
P: (870) 735-4373
F: (870) 735-2058
E-mail: ardsc@juno.com
www.ardsc.org

Delta Service Corps is an AmeriCorps program which enlists citizens ages 17 and older to address the educational and human needs of the Delta region of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The mission of the Delta Service Corps is to create positive change across the Delta through service. The program is a public/private partnership that unites support from federal and state government, foundations, corporations, community organizations, and the general public. Delta Service Corps promotes an ethic of citizenship and service by giving people of different backgrounds and ages the opportunity to serve together and make a difference in their communities.

Habitat for Humanity

Habitat for Humanity International
1010 Vermont Ave. NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
P: (202) 628-9171 x105
Email: publicinfo@hfhi.org
www.habitat.org

Habitat for Humanity International is a nonprofit, non-denominational Christian housing organization whose mission is to build simple, decent, affordable, houses in partnership with those in need of adequate shelter. Habitat for Humanity is building in more than 3,000 towns, cities, and villages in more than 80 countries worldwide. Local Habitat affiliates coordinate house building and select partner families.

Little Dixie Community Action Agency

502 West Duke
Hugo, OK 74743
P: (580)326-5201
F: (580) 326-0556
Email: cbuster@ldcaa.org
www.littledixie.org

The Little Dixie Community Action Agency was incorporated in 1968, and currently runs a number of programs among which are AmeriCorps, Self-Help Housing, Retired Senior Volunteer Program and many more, emphasizing the Agency's mission of "helping people help themselves."

Llano Grande

PO Box 127
Edcouch, Texas 78538
P: (956) 262-4474
Email: f_guajardo@yahoo.com
www.llanogrande.org

Founder: Francisco Guajardo

The Center, formalized in 1997 with support from the Annenberg Rural Challenge, today provides students with a range of leadership opportunities. In addition to its pre-college advising program which includes student visits to elite colleges, the Center sponsors an institute to build young people's skills in media; organizes a seminar series through which students, teachers, and community members dialogue around issues such as education, economy, and sustainable development; and publishes a dual language journal dedicated to sharing the stories of community members. It has supported students' production of a documentary film on their community, offered space and student support to the local chamber of commerce, and designed an innovative Spanish immersion institute for students from outside the community to hone their language skills by spending three weeks with local families.

Mid South Delta LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)

733 3rd Avenue, 8th Floor
New York, NY, 10017
P: (212) 455-9800
F: (212) 682-5929.
www.liscnet.org

Through its national rural program and each of its local program offices, LISC targets its resources toward critical elements of the community development process. LISC provides grants, loans and equity investments to CDCs (Community Development Corporation) for neighborhood redevelopment. National LISC matches locally-raised funds and contributes them to communities with new projects for renovation. The CDC then designates the funds to a variety of projects that will best suit the neighborhood, and the renovation begins.

The NORCAM Group

4200 Crawford Avenue
Northern Cambria, PA 15714
P: (814)948-4444
F: (814)948-4449
Email: norcam@surfshop.net
www.ruralisc.org/norcam.htm

President: Jerry Brant

Northern Cambria Community Development Corporation's (NORCAM) mission is to promote sustainable regional growth through the creation and/or support of local education, business, and housing activities. Among NORCAM's projects are rehabilitation of vacant buildings for sale to local businesses, job training and placement services for low-income people and former welfare recipients, and community development through construction of a regional trail network using abandoned railroad lines as multi-purpose recreational trails.

Quitman County Development Organization, INC.

201 Humphrey Street
Marks, MS 38646
Post Office Box 386
P: (662) 326-4000
F: (662) 326-3904
Email: greenant@excite.com
www.qcdo.org/Index.htm

Founder: Robert Jackson

The Quitman County Development Organization houses a community development credit union, an independent insurance agency, a housing development project, a coin-operated laundry, and a day care center. These activities lend themselves to the strengthening of the county; for example, the day care center is located on the high school campus, making it possible for teen mothers to complete high school, and the credit union is led and run by youth to encourage and train young people to save, invest, and manage financial assets.

Rural Action

PO Box 157
Trimble, OH 45782
P: (740) 767-4938
F: (740) 767-4957
Email: RAttrimbl@ruralaction.org
www.ruralaction.org/

Rural Action's mission is to promote economic, social, and environmental justice in Appalachian Ohio through the creation of model strategies for the region that involve a broad base of citizens in building environmental, economic, and social sustainability. Rural Action has projects in 14 counties and makes an impact on most of the 29 counties of Ohio Appalachia.

Rural School and Community Trust

1825 K Street NW, Suite 703
Washington, DC 20006
P: (202) 955-7177
F: (202) 955-7179
www.ruraledu.org

President: Rachel Tompkins

The Rural School and Community Trust (Rural Trust) is the premier national nonprofit organization addressing the crucial relationship between good schools and thriving rural communities. Working in some of the poorest, most challenging rural places, the Rural Trust involves young people in learning linked to their communities, improves the quality of teaching and school leadership, advocates for appropriate state educational policies, and addresses the critical issue of funding for rural schools.

Southern Rural Development Center (SRDC)

Box 9656
410 Bost Extension Bldg.
Mississippi State, MS 39762
P: (662) 325-3207
F: (662) 325-8915
Email: ljb@srdc.msstate.edu
srdc.msstate.edu/

Director: Lionel J. (Bo) Beaulieu

The Southern Rural Development Center seeks to strengthen the capacity of the region's 29 land-grant institutions to address critical contemporary rural development issues impacting the well-being of people and communities in the rural South.

Among the SRDC's goals are to stimulate the formation of multi-state research teams; to coordinate the development and revision of educational materials and maintain a centralized repository of educational resources; to organize and deliver high priority rural development research and educational workshops/conferences; and to provide leadership for the preparation of science-based rural development policy reports.

Strengthening Alliance of Veterans and Families (SAVF)/ AmeriCorps

Dept. of Navajo Veterans Affairs
P.O. Box 430
Window Rock, AZ 86515
P: (928) 871-6470
F: (928) 871-6567
Email: SClark@OMB.Navajo.org

SAVF is an AmeriCorps Program that supports 18 members who ensure that Navajo veterans and their families are accessing quality healthcare and other social services. AC members are based in 5 veterans' affairs offices across the Navajo Reservation in Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Tyrell County CDC/Youth Corps Program

Tyrrell County CDC
P.O. Box 58 Columbia, NC 27925
P: (252) 796-1991
Email: tccdc@beachlink.com

Executive Director: Mavis Hill

Tyrell County CDC focuses its efforts on job creation through a sustainable small business incubator and a Youth Conservation Corps program. An outgrowth of the Youth Corps program is the sustainable internships program — graduates of the Youth Corps can apply to be placed in internships with local state-run conservation agencies. The CDC is researching possibilities to purchase a 45-acre hog farm and turn it into a site for native plant nurseries, aquaculture, green houses, and mushroom growing. Native plants could be used for wetland restoration, and the NC Department of Transportation could potentially purchase these plants for planting on highway medians.

Background on National and Community Service

by Shirley Sagawa

Service is rooted in the history of America, and ranges from the informal help we might give a neighbor to the government-run, full-time corps of the Depression era. It is useful to think about the forms of service across this spectrum.

Much of what could be considered **informal service** occurs without any structure, the result of an ethic of service to others that is passed on through families, schools, civic organizations, and, at times, popular culture.

Organized service also has a long history, from the early days of the Red Cross to the Freedom Schools of the '60s. Today, organized service takes place through the efforts of individual nonprofit organizations sponsoring volunteer programs, faith-based organizations, civic organizations, employers, and others who see a role for volunteers in achieving their missions. [See chart on types of service programs.] Organized service may involve the matching of individual volunteers to service projects at the one extreme, or highly structured group projects at the other. These forms of organized service range from a one-time group project or ongoing placements requiring volunteers to give a few hours a week, to full-time youth corps for disadvantaged youth or fellowship programs for young professionals.

Service-learning (service linked to learning) and other forms of youth service have become increasingly popular forms of organized service. Often sponsored by schools, higher education institutions, or other organizations concerned with youth development, these forms tend to emphasize the connection with the curriculum, value of the service experience for the person performing the service, partnerships with community organizations, and development of civic values.

Government support for nonmilitary service has focused on supporting organized service that achieves specific goals. Service has figured in priority efforts of

many presidents, including: **President Franklin Roosevelt's** Civilian Conservation Corps, intended to provide jobs for unemployed youth who worked to enhance America's national parks and other civic projects; **President Kennedy's** Peace Corps addressed foreign policy objectives; its domestic counterpart, VISTA, was created during the **Johnson** Administration as a part of the war on poverty, along with the Foster Grandparents program. The Senior Companions, RSVP, and other older American programs were created during the **Nixon** administration as part of an effort to support productive aging.

The last two decades have seen a dramatic expansion in government support for service programs. **President George Bush** requested government funding for the Points of Light Foundation with the goal of encouraging more Americans to volunteer. This legislation also provided funding for a Commission on National and Community Service, which funded Congressionally designed service-learning and youth corps programs, as well as a demonstration program for full- and part-time national service. **President Clinton** proposed the AmeriCorps program as a strategy to enable young people to earn money for college or to pay back student loans through a year of full-time service or its part-time equivalent. His legislation created the Corporation for National Service (which consolidated the Commission on National and Community Service and the ACTION agency). During the Clinton Administration, service was a core strategy employed in the America Reads initiative to help all children read independently by third grade, as well as a part of disaster relief efforts and other initiatives. Most recently, **President George W. Bush** created the USA Freedom Corps, an initiative to engage service participants in homeland security efforts.

Today, most of these federal programs continue to receive government support. The Corporation for

National Service provides funding for three major program categories:

- **Learn and Serve America** supports service-learning programs in schools, institutions of higher education, and community organizations that help nearly one million students, from kindergarten through college, meet community needs while improving their academic skills and learning the habits of good citizenship. Learn and Serve grants are used to create new programs or replicate existing programs, as well as to provide training and development to staff, faculty, and volunteers. Funding is provided through state education agencies, State Commissions on national and community service, nonprofit organizations, Indian tribes, and U.S. territories, which then select and fund local service-learning programs. Institutions of higher education and consortia are funded directly.
- **AmeriCorps** is a network of national service programs that engage more than 50,000 Americans each year in intensive service to meet critical needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment. AmeriCorps members serve through more than 2,100 nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations. Full-time members receive living allowances, health and child care benefits, and education awards of \$4,725 for each year of service (living allowances and education awards are available to part-time members on a pro-rated basis). AmeriCorps members may serve up to two years full-time. AmeriCorps is made up of three programs. In **AmeriCorps*State and National**, more than three-quarters of grant funding goes to Governor-appointed State Commissions, which in turn distribute and monitor grants to local nonprofits and agencies. The other quarter goes to national nonprofits that operate programs in more than one state. The organizations receiving grants are responsible for recruiting, selecting, and supervising AmeriCorps members. **AmeriCorps*VISTA** members serve full-time for a year in nonprofits, public agencies and faith-based groups to help bring individuals and communities out of poverty. About 6,000 AmeriCorps*VISTA members served in 1,200 local programs selected by Corporation for National Service state offices. **AmeriCorps*NCCC** is a 10-month, full-time residential program for men and women between the ages of 18 and 24, intended to

combine the best practices of civilian service with the best aspects of military service. Members serve in teams of 10 to 15 members based at one of five campuses across the country but are sent to work on short-term projects in neighboring states.

Approximately 1,000 members serve in AmeriCorps*NCCC.

- **Senior Corps** is a network of programs that tap the experience, skills, and talents of older citizens to meet community challenges. It includes three programs. **RSVP (the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program)**, one of the largest volunteer efforts in the nation, engages people 55 and over in a diverse range of volunteer activities. Approximately 480,000 volunteers serve an average of four hours a week at an estimated 65,000 local organizations through 766 RSVP projects. The **Foster Grandparent Program**, through its local grantees, enables income eligible individuals 60 and over to serve 20 hours per week in schools, hospitals, correctional institutions, daycare facilities, and Head Start centers. More than 30,000 Foster Grandparents serve 275,000 young children and teenagers. They receive \$2.65 per hour for their service. The **Senior Companion Program**, through its local grantees, enables income eligible individuals 60 and over to serve 20 hours per week to provide assistance and friendship to adults who have difficulty with daily living tasks, such as grocery shopping and bill paying. The 15,500 Senior Companions serve more than 61,000 adults. They receive \$2.65 per hour for their service.

Support for youth corps also comes from several other agencies (including HUD, through the **YouthBuild** program), as well as AmeriCorps. The Department of Education's **College Work Study** program also supports service by mandating that colleges and universities use a portion of their funding for community service placements.

These government funding streams have enabled organized service programs to multiply across the country. For example, before the enactment of Learn and Serve America, just a half dozen states had staff focusing on service-learning in their state educational agencies; today, almost all do. As a result of AmeriCorps funding, the number of full-time service positions has increased ten-fold. While government does not support

informal service, evidence suggests that participation in an organized service program increases individuals' propensity to perform informal service. Government support has impacted service across the spectrum — involving the youngest elementary students to the oldest Americans. It has supported the growth of many program forms, from highly structured full-time youth corps programs to incidental volunteer projects. These have added to the array of service opportunities available to Americans of all ages and backgrounds, reinvigorating the service ethic and strengthening communities in a variety of important ways.

Glossary of Terms

AmeriCorps is a network of national service programs that engage more than 50,000 Americans each year in intensive service to meet critical needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment. AmeriCorps members serve through more than 2,100 nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations. In return for a year of full-time service, or its part-time equivalent, AmeriCorps members receive an education award of \$4,725.

Senior Corps is a network of programs that tap the experience, skills, and talents of older citizens to meet community challenges. Through its three programs — Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions, and RSVP (the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program) — more than half a million Americans, 55 and over, assist local nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations in carrying out their missions.

Youth Corps programs engage young people, generally 16-25 years old, in paid, productive, full-time work which benefits both the young people and their communities. Corpsmembers most often work in crews or teams of eight to twelve with a paid adult supervisor who sets and models clear standards of behavior. Youth corps crews undertake a wide range of work projects. Some are similar to the forestry and parks projects of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s. Others fill gaps in the services of urban parks, renovate housing, and assist human service agencies. Most corpsmembers receive at least minimum wage for their work. Corpsmembers devote part of each week to improving their basic education skills and to preparing for future employment. Most corps not only offer

pre-GED, GED, and college credit courses, but also offer classes focusing on essential life skills, such as budgeting, parenting, and personal health and well-being.

Service-learning combines service to the community with student learning in a way that improves both the student and the community. According to the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, service-learning:

- Is a method whereby students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of communities. Is coordinated with an elementary school, secondary school, institution of higher education, or community service program and the community;
- Helps foster civic responsibility;
- Is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students, or the education components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled;
- And provides structured time for students or participants to reflect on the service experience

National Service has many definitions. Some people use the term to describe full-time service programs that are linked to benefits, such as money for college. Military service might be included under this definition, along with civilian service programs. Others consider national service to be service in any program funded by the Corporation for National Service. AmeriCorps is considered under both definitions to be a national service program.

Community Service is used to describe many forms of service that take place within communities. Because the term is sometimes used to describe court-ordered service as an alternative sentence for minor crimes, some people do not like to use “community service” to describe other forms of service. Some people consider “community service” to be service that is not “service-learning.” The most common definition equates community service with part-time volunteer service that takes place at the community level, regardless of the source of funding for the program or its learning objectives.

Volunteers perform service that benefits others. Some people equate the term "volunteer" with "unpaid" and do not consider participants in service programs that provide stipends to be volunteers (for this reason, participants in AmeriCorps are considered "members" rather than "volunteers"). Others consider the "voluntary" nature of the service, rather than whether or not it is compensated, to be a defining factor.

National and Community Service: Ten Years of National Service

by Judy Karasik

Executive Summary

Ten years ago, the Corporation for National Service opened for business following the enactment of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993.

National service programs include the Senior Corps, engaging older Americans in community service; Learn and Serve America, supporting service-learning programs for school-age and college youth; and AmeriCorps*State and National, AmeriCorps*VISTA, and AmeriCorps*NCCC, which all provide education awards in exchange for a year of full-time service or its equivalent. These programs are charged to achieve multiple goals: strengthen communities; develop participants; and “get things done” to address educational, public safety, environmental, or other human needs. Except for AmeriCorps*NCCC, the programs are run by state/local public agencies or private nonprofit grantees, not federal government.

This paper, commissioned by the nonprofit Innovations in Civic Participation, draws on research evidence and interviews with program directors to determine whether national service has:

1. **Expanded local programs and services;**
2. **Improved service quality** by using strong evaluation methods, effective research-based practices in delivery, and high quality training and supervision;
3. **Increased agency collaboration;** and
4. **Exposed young people to careers in fields experiencing shortages** — including education, child care, and family services.

1. Expanding local programs and services

National service has delivered additional services in all programs in education, health and human needs

(including home construction/renovation), public safety, and environment.

Studies: Aguirre Senior Corps Accomplishment Reports (1999), Brandeis University study of Learn and Serve America (1999)

Examples: Seniors for Schools, American Youth Works (TX), Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, Learn and Serve programs

In addition, national service participants have recruited significant numbers of additional volunteers. They have trained and managed the community volunteers, labor-intensive functions that may be difficult for the underfunded nonprofits that could most use the volunteer help. Additional volunteers provided additional resources, strengthened and enlarged networks connecting programs to communities, and engaged residents of all ages in ways that made it likely that they continue to contribute to community life. AmeriCorps members often continue to volunteer themselves when off duty and after their term of service.

Studies: Aguirre VISTA Accomplishment Report (1999), *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre (1999)

Examples: PlusTime New Hampshire (NH), Yes!AmeriCorps (LA)

Cost-benefit analyses for AmeriCorps (including one validated by the General Accounting Office) estimate that the program returned between \$1.60 and \$2.60 for every dollar spent. Cost-benefit analyses for the Senior Programs estimated, at minimum rates, that RSVP returned \$9.30 for every dollar; Foster Grandparents returned \$1.43 for every dollar, and Senior Companions returned \$1.75 for every dollar. Learn and Serve America K-12 programs provided services that produced a 4 to 1 return on investment.

Studies: *The Benefits and Costs of National Service: Methods for Benefit Assessment with Application to Three AmeriCorps Programs* (1995), *Impact of AmeriCorps*State/National Direct on Members and Communities 1994–5 and 1995–6* (1999), *Getting Things Done in the Delta: Impacts of the Delta Service Corps, 2001–2002* (2003), *Evaluation of the Washington Service Corps: Final Report* (2000).

Examples: Lower Mississippi Delta Service Corps (MS), Washington Service Corps (WA).

2. Improving Service Quality

The Corporation mandated programs to develop impact evaluation, directed substantial resources supporting those skills and toward collection and dissemination of dependable assessment practices and effective practices in all program lines. High program quality appears to be the result of three interrelated strategies: strong evaluation methods that reflect on data to further improve impact; effective practices in delivery (research-based tutoring methods, for example); and high quality training and supervision. Supporting high quality, therefore, adds to program cost but on balance is worth it, since impact is directly related to high quality.

In the Corporation's largest single initiative, part of America Reads, gains were statistically significant and large enough to signify real improvement in students' reading abilities. Individual AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve programs report research-based practices resulting in high impact and say these are key to retaining partners.

Studies: *Foster Grandparents in Head Start Centers: Benefits for Children, Classrooms, and Centers*, Westat, 1998; *AmeriCorps Tutoring Outcomes Study*, Abt Associates, February 2001; *Coupling Service and Learning in Higher Education: The Final Report of the Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program*, RAND Education, May 1998, *The Evaluation of Jumpstart in 2000–2001; The Role and Value of Senior Companions in their Communities*, Research Triangle Institute, 2003; *A Comprehensive Assessment — AmeriCorps: Getting Good Things Done in Northern California*, BTW Consultants, 1999.

Examples: America Reads, Jumpstart, Frostburg State

University Learn and Serve Program, PlusTime New Hampshire, Action for Children Today, Senior Companion Program.

3. Increasing Agency Collaboration

Experts interested in service delivery, nonprofit effectiveness, and efficient use of resources believe collaboration plays a key role in improvement. Increasingly, agencies attempt to coordinate services among agencies, augment the range of services, and bring what's needed closer to the consumer.

National service appears to have played a useful role in bringing agencies together in coordinated service delivery, strengthening links between schools, community organizations, and businesses, bringing together organizations that did not usually work together, and eliminating inter-agency bottlenecks. Specific programs have used service to eliminate service duplication in a region where resources are few, provide services to families during nontraditional hours (weekends and evenings), and facilitate collaboration among a university, faith-based organizations, schools, and city government.

Studies: *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International; *Getting Things Done in the Delta: Impacts of the Delta Service Corps, 2001–2002*, Dr. Harrison J. Campbell, Jr., University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC; *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003

Examples: Energy Express (WV), Delta Service Corps (MS), California Alliance for Prevention (CA), W.E.B. DuBois Institute Project (MD), PlusTime New Hampshire

4. Exposing Young People to Careers in Fields Experiencing Shortages

AmeriCorps grantees often attract talented young people to serve in professions low on qualified recruits. Learn and Serve Higher Education initiatives are often practicum, whether in teaching, law enforcement, health, or other pre-professional areas.

National service often recruits members from low-income rural and urban communities. Programs that successfully support and retain locally — and in high-quality, high-impact programs retention can be as high

as 98 percent — report that members stay in home communities, reversing the brain drain and creating professionals able to tap networks impenetrable to outsiders. For these strategically valuable recruits, the living allowance, health care, and child care benefits make service possible and the AmeriCorps education award makes the next step of professional training imaginable. The chance to explore future job and educational interests is the second most common reason given for joining AmeriCorps, yet no national effort exists to encourage these pathways. The potential remains underdeveloped and under-examined by research.

Studies: *Summary Report: National Evaluation of Learn and Serve America*, Brandeis University Center for Human Resources, 1999, *The Impact of AmeriCorps Service on ACT Alumni*, AmeriCorps Action for Children Today, NACCRA, March 2003; *A Profile of AmeriCorps Members at Baseline*, Abt Associates, June 2001; *Washington Reading Corps: Impacts of National Service and the Community: 1999–2000*, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, October 2000; *Evaluation of the Washington Service Corps*, Abt Associates, September 2000; *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003

Examples: Teach for America, NACCRRA/Action for Children Today, Washington Reading Corps (WA), Yes!AmeriCorps (LA), California Alliance for Prevention Corps (CA),

Recommendations for Next Steps

National service is “getting things done” in the four key areas discussed. In some cases, these results have been enhanced through deliberate strategies at the federal level; in others, they have emerged through the innovative — and often isolated — efforts of individual local programs.

To maximize the potential of national service, support might include:

- A.** Encouraging the replication of programs with strong research-based practices and strong impact data. Strategies include:
 - Expanding funding for AmeriCorps*National, which by design, encourages the replication of program models in more than one state;
- B.** Continuing to enhance quality through:
 - Supporting research-based effective practices;
 - While supporting replication, also ensuring funding for new and innovative solutions using service;
 - Preserving local control, despite the fact that this makes it difficult to aggregate or compare program accomplishments; on balance, it appears necessary;
 - Creating opportunities and networks for programs working on similar issues to learn from one another, and from experts on the issues outside the national service field; and
 - Supporting the cost of quality to ensure that organizations have the capacity to:
 - recruit, train, supervise, and retain national service participants;
 - identify and develop research-based practices by evaluating impact and improving program models as a result of what they have learned;
 - work effectively in collaboration.
- C.** Taking advantage of the large and growing network of national service alumni to expand the pool of professionals in fields experiencing shortages. Strategies include:
 - Providing funding for a national alumni association that is able to connect alumni with training and career opportunities;

- Encouraging partnerships between AmeriCorps and institutions of higher learning that offer professional training in targeted fields;
- Encouraging the development of new professional corps programs; and
- Formalizing pathways from service to career through innovative programs.

Finally, to build these networks and systems, AmeriCorps and other national service programs require a strong and stable funding base that includes support not just for programs, but also education awards, benefits, training, evaluation, and recruitment.

The laboratory of the past ten years has provided a range of cost-effective solutions with multiple benefits to communities. Working with many partners, including community agencies, service providers and educators, federal, state, and local government, volunteers, houses of worship, and Americans of all ages, national service has demonstrated a multitude of practical solutions for our most pressing social issues. In the next decade, these practical solutions could be replicated in communities across the country.

Introduction

Ten years ago, the Corporation for National Service opened for business following the enactment of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. This legislation brought together the pre-existing VISTA, Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America¹ with the newly authorized AmeriCorps*State and National and AmeriCorps*NCCC. These federal programs, together with the state and local grantees that recruit, train, place, and supervise service participants, are referred to in this paper as “national service programs,” although many could also be characterized as “service-learning,” “community service,” or “volunteer” programs.

The Corporation’s national service programs were designed to serve three major goals: strengthen communities; develop participants; and “get things done” to address educational, public safety, environmental, and other human needs. This paper examines research evi-

dence, supplemented by interviews of program directors, to determine whether national and community service programs have achieved the goal of “getting things done.”

An examination of this sort is difficult because national service program design, including the needs to be addressed, is in fact, locally driven. It would be far easier to assess community impact with greater uniformity of program design imposed at the federal level. However, the local nature of the program appears to be one of its strengths, as shown by the degree of innovation seen in the programs and the way in which they are rooted in grassroots organizations and local communities. Throughout this paper we will cite impact outcomes for individual programs, understanding that while they are an essential measure of whether a program has delivered worthwhile services, the design of the national initiative eliminates the possibility of meaningful aggregation of impact data across programs.

After a short background section describing the major national service programs, this paper will examine the ways in which national service has improved service delivery in a variety of educational, public safety, environmental, and human service fields. Specifically, it will look at how national service has:

- **Expanded local programs and services;**
- **Improved service quality** by using strong evaluation methods, effective research-based practices in delivery, and high quality training and supervision;
- **Increased agency collaboration;** and
- **Exposed young people to careers in fields experiencing shortages** — including education, child care, and family services.

What is National Service?

National Service, for purposes of this paper, is defined broadly to include programs receiving funding from Learn and Serve America, AmeriCorps, and the Senior Corps programs, which are all administered by the Corporation for National and Community Service. These programs cover a wide age spectrum, and vary in the type of service provided (some are constrained by their authorizing legislation to focus on a single issue); income of participants (some are limited to low-

¹ Formerly known as “Serve America.”

income individuals); age or education status of participants; and benefits provided (some programs provide living allowances and other supports, while others specifically prohibit them).

What these programs have in common is the mandate to achieve multiple goals, including strengthening communities; develop participants; and “get things done” to address educational, public safety, environmental, or other human needs. Except for AmeriCorps*NCCC, national service programs are, in fact, operated by state and local public agencies or private nonprofit grantees rather than the federal government. Grantees determine specific ways that they will achieve their goals and raise at least a portion of their budgets from sources outside the Corporation. For AmeriCorps, the Corporation administers education awards and helps with recruitment, although selection and placement of AmeriCorps Members is done by the grantee itself.

Corporation-funded programs include:

AmeriCorps: Full-time AmeriCorps members devote one to two years of intensive service to meet critical needs in education, public safety, health, and the environment. Part-time AmeriCorps members serve a minimum of 300 hours per year and may serve for up to six years. Members receive a living allowance and benefits, plus an education award of \$4,725 for each year of full-time service (pro-rated for part-time members). AmeriCorps members serve through more than 2,100 nonprofits, public agencies, and faith-based organizations.

Between 1994 and 2003, a quarter of a million AmeriCorps members served. In the first year of operation, 200 AmeriCorps*State and National programs put close to 8,000 members in 427 operating sites.² For the 2002–03 program year, 50,000 AmeriCorps members were in the field. The majority were enrolled in **AmeriCorps*State** programs, funded through state commissions, and **AmeriCorps*National** programs, operated by nonprofit organizations running programs in more than one state. (The AmeriCorps*National programs are awarded about one-fourth of the amount awarded to the AmeriCorps*State programs.) An additional 6,000 members were **AmeriCorps*VISTAs**, who focus their activities on supporting community and faith-based organizations in meeting the needs of low-income communities. Finally, 1,200 full-time

members served with **AmeriCorps*National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC)**, a ten-month, full-time residential service program for men and women that combines the best practices of civilian services with the best aspects of military service, including leadership and team-building.

Learn and Serve America’s portfolios include school based service-learning, community-based programs, and programs in higher education. In 2001, Learn and Serve assisted 106 school- and community-based projects in enrolling approximately one million students in service-learning activities. In that same year, 68 college and university projects supported by Learn and Serve America enrolled approximately 60,000 participants. Together these 174 grantees operated approximately 2,500 local programs in schools, nonprofits, and higher education institutions.³ In general, Learn and Serve America participants do not receive stipends or benefits for their service.

The National Senior Service Corps (NSSC) in 2003 has more than 500,000 Americans serving. The greatest number is in the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP): 480,000 RSVPs serve from a few hours a week to nearly fulltime in a wide range of service projects. The more than 30,000 Foster Grandparents, persons 60 years of age or older whose income cannot exceed certain eligibility guidelines, who receive small hourly stipends, serve 15 to 40 hours a week in prisons, schools, hospitals, daycare centers, and Head Start

² *AmeriCorps State/National Programs Impact Evaluation: First Year Report*, Aguirre International, June 1997, pp. i–iv Members tutored 14,543 Head Start and Kindergarten children; in grades K through twelve, 76,492 students were taught, 59,860 were tutored, 53,223 were mentored and counseled, and 143,533 received enrichment activities. Service-learning and community education activities benefited 116,380 students, and members helped 12,088 adults with parenting skills and 7,544 with basic skills development, including preparation for obtaining GEDs. Members recruited 2,900 peer student tutors, trained 76 percent of them, and recruited 8,307 non-student volunteers. Members developed curricular materials in many subjects, used by 67,535 children. That only covers education. Members provided services in independent living, in job counseling, in transportation to health services, in health screenings, in prenatal counseling, in immunization. They helped the homeless to find temporary or permanent shelter, assisted potential homeowners in housing services and loan development. They trained schoolchildren in conflict resolution, created neighborhood watches, and child and senior escort programs. They counseled victims of violence and drug users or those at risk of drug use. They built shelters for the homeless, established neighborhood gardens, planted thousands of trees. They repaired trails and parks, preserved wetlands and educated the public on environmental issues.

³ *Fiscal 2003 Budget Estimate and Performance Plan: Activities Authorized by the National and Community Service Act, Submission to Congress*, Corporation for National and Community Service, February 4, 2002.

centers. Finally, the 15,000 Senior Companions are: persons 60 years of age or older whose income cannot exceed certain eligibility guidelines. They receive small hourly stipends and serve 15 to 20 hours per week, caring for frail adults (and providing related services and respite to their families and caretaking friends).⁴ The Impact of National Service on Important Community Needs

First Element: Expanding local programs and services

An assumption underlying national service is that it enables programs to serve more clients, serve them for longer hours, or otherwise expand their reach. This section reviews the evidence that indicates:

- How many additional services were delivered through national service;
- How many additional volunteers were “leveraged” by national service participants; and
- How much these services were worth in dollars and to what degree benefits outweighed costs.

A. Additional Services Delivered Through National Service

AmeriCorps, from its founding, has tracked the output of its members who perform service in education, health and human needs, public safety, and the environment, or in special initiatives as directed by Congress or the Corporation. Data collected from 522 AmeriCorps*State and National programs showed that during the 1997–98 program year, more than 17.6 million people benefited from AmeriCorps service. Members personally provided services to 10.1 million individuals, including:

- 2 million students who received educational services such as tutoring, mentoring, after-school programs, or received other services.
- Nearly 250,000 young children who received care, instruction, or immunization.
- 54,000 parents who were trained in parenting skills.

The remaining 7.8 million individuals served by AmeriCorps received a variety of education, other human needs, and public safety services, or benefited

from disaster relief activities. Senior Corps programs also track the number of individuals served. Data collected in 1999–2000 indicated that RSVP volunteers tutored more than 170,000 students, and helped an additional 350,000 obtain tutoring services, in addition to providing human, educational, or environmental services to millions of other individuals.⁵ Foster Grandparents assisted 71,000 children in Head Start, 53,000 hospitalized children, 47,000 youth offenders and ex-offenders, 10,000 children of families of violence, and hundreds of thousands of additional children.⁶ Finally, Senior Companions provided services such as light housekeeping, meal preparation, and nutritional information to over 25,000 frail adults needing long-term care at home; provided nurturing and support to 5,000 terminally ill adults; provided respite service to over 18,000 frail adults and their caregivers; and assisted tens of thousands of other frail and elderly adults.⁷

While these aggregate numbers can be helpful measures, it is easier to imagine what they mean in the context of individual programs. For example, tutoring and other literacy-related activities have been among the most common types of service performed by national service participants. For example, the Seniors for Schools program, a Senior Corps demonstration program developed as part of America Reads, recruited, trained, and supervised adults over the age of 55 to help children read. In the program’s first three years, the seniors tripled the number of students receiving help, from 1,642 to 5,462 children (in the same period the program doubled the number of its volunteers and the

⁴ 29,000 Foster Grandparents serving over 26 million hours. 70 percent in Education; 14 percent in Human Needs Services; 12 percent in Health and Nutrition; 4 percent in Public Safety; 14,700 Senior Companions serving over 12.5 million hours. 49 percent in Human Needs Services; 44 percent in Health and Nutrition; 5 percent in Community and Economic Development; 2 percent in Public Safety; 484,000 RSVP Volunteers serving over 78 million hours. 31 percent in Human Needs Services, 30 percent in Health and Nutrition; 14 percent in Community and Economic Development; 12 percent in Education; 9 percent in Leadership; 3 percent in Public Safety; and 1 percent in Environment. *2000 Foster Grandparents Accomplishment Report*, Aguirre International, April 2001, pp.5–6.; *2000 Senior Companion Accomplishment Report*, Aguirre International, April 2001, pp.4–5; *2000 RSVP Accomplishment Report*, Aguirre International, April 2001, pp.8–9

⁵ *2000 RSVP Accomplishment Report*, Aguirre International, April 2001, p. 1.

⁶ *2000 Foster Grandparent Accomplishment Report*, Aguirre International, April 2001, pp. 1–2.

⁷ *2000 Senior Companion Accomplishment Report*, Aguirre International, April 2001, p. 1.

number of schools served, while the number of additional volunteers increased from 234 to 486). Impact data indicate instruction was effective. In its third year 58 percent of the tutored students gained in their reading level by one full level or more and 39 percent were reading at their expected grade level by post-test — despite the fact that 94 percent of students tested had started the year below their expected reading level, some by two levels or more. Ninety-two percent of all students tutored improved their reading skills. Principals, staff, and teachers commented, “Each and every student made progress that they would not have made without the help of the volunteers. . . . The reading scores of the students served all increased.”⁸

These kinds of results were not limited to education-related programs. In a low-income neighborhood in Austin, Texas, American Youth Works AmeriCorps members constructed 76 energy-efficient affordable homes, so state-of-the-art that they became learning sites visited by builders who wanted to see how to use the latest materials and achieve utility decreases of as much as 40 percent per month.⁹ The sixty AmeriCorps members of the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP) program educated farmworkers in 18 states on pesticide safety, and through translation services, referral, and transportation, connected migrant workers to available services, including health care, food, and clothing, in the permanent communities where they worked. In 2002, AmeriCorps reached farmworker families with over 25,000 supportive services — including health and dental care, food, and clothing — trained over 5,000 community members on pesticide risk reduction, and provided effective pesticide safety training to over 20,000 farmworker adults and teens and close to 5,000 farmworker children. Without AmeriCorps, these services would not have been provided. Even the young students serving through Learn and Serve America were able to expand services in the community; a 1999 study of the program found that 90 percent of agencies where students served indicated that the students had helped the agency improve their services, and 68 percent said the students had increased the agencies’ capacities to take on new projects.¹⁰ And a study of the Senior Companion Program found that the senior volunteers enabled agencies to serve additional clients (an average of 45 additional clients) and provide additional services to their present clients.

Increased numbers tell a straightforward story. The

pages that follow attempt to paint a more nuanced picture of the dynamics and the impact that appear to be particularly characteristic of national service initiatives.

B. Additional Volunteers “Leveraged” by National Service

To measure the overall impact of national service, it is necessary to include the accomplishments not just of the national service participants, but of any additional volunteers they recruit or supervise. In recent years, the Corporation for National and Community Service has required all AmeriCorps programs to recruit additional volunteers. These volunteers provided additional resources and also, by their involvement, strengthened and enlarged the networks connecting programs to communities. National service participants, however, have not only recruited additional volunteers, but have also managed them.

Small organizations can be reluctant or unable to take the time and effort to recruit, screen, and supervise volunteers; these labor-intensive functions may be low priorities for underfunded nonprofits. Research indicates VISTA has helped to fill this gap — in 1999 AmeriCorps*VISTA members serving with small community-based organizations recruited more than 283,000 volunteers donating 6.6 million volunteer hours, a 100 percent increase since 1997. Each VISTA, on average, recruited 52 community volunteers.¹¹ This same study suggests that the organizations where VISTAs serve would have to scale down considerably if these volunteers — and their AmeriCorps*VISTA managers—were lost.¹²

⁸ *Seniors for Schools: Evaluation Results, 1999-2000 School Year*, Project STAR, January 2001, p. 3, 20-22, and 16. The program not only expanded, but built organizational strength for its future: it accessed resources for sustainability, developed evaluation skills, assessed managerial challenges systematically, and monitored the working relationships with their host schools.

⁹ Interview with Richard Halpin, American Youth Works, April 21, 2003. The program also works effectively to link its AmeriCorps members to educational opportunity. American Youth Works’ own charter school has a strong relationship to the local community college and starts members working on college credit courses while they’re in high school, to prove to them that college is something they are capable of. In return, the members tend to stay and build the community.

¹⁰ *Summary Report: National Evaluation of Learn and Serve America*, Brandeis University Center for Human Resources, 1999, p. 20.

¹¹ The number of volunteers recruited that year for education and literacy activities quadrupled; and volunteers building the capacity of organizations grew threefold. *1999 AmeriCorps*VISTA Accomplishments*, Aguirre International, October 2000, pp. iii, 4, 6.

Plus Time New Hampshire, a nonprofit organization that helps communities start up and improve after-school programs, made volunteer recruitment a priority as a way to assist its partner organizations, and uses AmeriCorps members to help recruit and manage the volunteers, who currently number over 600 and provided 45,000 hours of service in 2002. “You have to know what motivates an individual,” says Cynthia Billings of Plus Time. “Volunteers have a wide range of motives. If you manage them well, and give them the right training and support, each volunteer can have a fulfilling experience that contributes positively to after-school programs. There is no question about it: our non-profits could never do what they do without volunteers.”¹³

For some national service programs, generating volunteers is central to their strategies for building sustainable ongoing service delivery. For example, one project sponsored by Yes!AmeriCorps, based at a YMCA in New Orleans, begins its work by tutoring children after-school at a Hispanic apartment complex. After sessions, AmeriCorps members visit with the children’s families in their apartments, learning more about the issues that concern them. This leads to gatherings of three or four neighbors, still identifying issues (family violence, HIV/AIDS prevention, immigration and citizenship), then even larger groups, “Family Circles,” where resources are brought in to meet those needs. Having done their own needs assessment, the people in the complex are targeted to help out and are developed as leaders. Some volunteers are children: one middle school boy wants to be a teacher; he is now tutoring younger children; another child with strong computer skills is strengthening younger kids’ computer skills. This kind of volunteer recruitment is labor intensive, and couldn’t be done by posting flyers or listing volunteer jobs on the Internet. But it serves three important purposes — it brings additional services to the families into the complex, it enables young people to see themselves as resources with real value, and it engages residents of all ages in ways that make it likely that they will continue to contribute to community life.¹⁴

AmeriCorps members, in addition to recruiting other volunteers, add to the resource base of community organizations in another important way — by continuing to volunteer themselves when off duty and after they complete their term of service.¹⁵

C. How Much These Services Were Worth in Dollars and To What Degree Benefits Outweighed Costs

Calculating the dollar value of service hours is another way that programs assess the size of what has been delivered under national service. Programs also compare the dollar value of services to the cost of the initiatives.

For example, in 1999–2000, RSVP Volunteers provided, estimated at minimum rates, over \$400 million in services — the cost of the program that year to the taxpayer was \$43 million.¹⁶ Foster Grandparents provided, estimated at minimum rates, \$133.7 million in services, while the program’s cost was just over \$93 million.¹⁷ Senior Companions provided, estimated at minimum rates, \$64.2 million in services — and that program cost \$36.5 million.¹⁸ Learn and Serve America K–12 programs provided services that were valued by the agencies where students served at a dollar value of \$8.76 per hour, making the average value of service per participant \$585 against a cost per participant of \$149 — a 4 to 1 return on investment.¹⁹

¹² VISTA’s 828 sponsoring organizations in 1999 had a median number of nine permanent paid staff; 694 of those organizations used volunteers: a median number of 90 each. The multiplier of effectively used volunteers is tremendous. *1999 AmeriCorps*VISTA Accomplishments*, Aguirre International, October 2000, pp. iii., 4, 6.

¹³ Interview with Cynthia Billings, Plus Time New Hampshire, April 23, 2003.

¹⁴ Interview with Lou C. Johnson and Ifama Arsan, Yes!AmeriCorps, April 24, 2003.

¹⁵ *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International, n.d. (September 1999), pp.34–35. [add cite on continuing to volunteer after serving]

¹⁶ *RSVP Accomplishment Report: October 1999–September 2000*, Aguirre International, April 2001, pp. 12–29. At minimum (based on the federal minimum hourly wage of \$5.15), an estimated \$44.1 million in education services, an estimated \$144 million in health and nutrition services, an estimated \$80.3 million in human needs services, an estimated \$68.2 million in community and economic development services, an estimated \$4 million in environmental service, an estimated \$12 million in public safety services, and an estimated \$48.2 million in leadership services. The maximum total for the year (based on the Independent Sector’s valuation of the equivalent hourly wage for volunteers of \$15.39) is over one billion dollars.

¹⁷ *Foster Grandparents Accomplishment Report: October 1999–September 2000*, Aguirre International, April 2001, pp. 9–15. At minimum (based on the federal minimum hourly wage of \$5.15), an estimated \$93.7 million in education services, an estimated \$16 million in health and nutrition services, an estimated \$17.4 million in human needs services, and an estimated \$6.6 million in public safety services. The **maximum** total (based on the Independent Sector’s valuation of the equivalent hourly wage for volunteers of \$15.39) is \$400 million.

An independent cost-benefit study funded by the Charles A. Dana Foundation, IBM International Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, and Youth Service California found that programs supported by AmeriCorps returned between \$1.60 and \$2.60 for every dollar spent. The General Accounting Office validated the methodology and approach used in this independent study. Another independent study found that AmeriCorps produced, on average, a return of \$1.66 for every dollar invested.²⁰

Several individual AmeriCorps programs have also estimated the dollar value of their work and compared its costs to its benefits. An independent evaluation of the 2001–02 service year of The Lower Mississippi Delta Service Corps found \$2.20 of benefits for every \$1 of federal expenditure.²¹

The California Alliance for Prevention claims high long-range savings to the state due to a reduced reliance on government programs and services, in this case, foster care placements, hospitalizations, emergency room visits, and costs of child protective service worker time incurred during the same period that the home visitor program is provided. Using the State of California's figure of \$44,000 as the annual cost for a child in the child welfare system, and applying the decrease from 16 percent to 5 percent of program families with prior history of substantiated child abuse and neglect, CAPC's report claims potentially 239 families who have not re-entered the system for a cost savings of more than \$10 million.²²

The Washington Service Corps' 2000 study examined three projects, determining conservatively (not taking into account "non-monetized" benefits including the long-term effects of tutoring on children, increased member skills, and general community revitalization) that the programs generated \$1.67 for every dollar invested.²³

These studies provide evidence that national service has been effective at expanding services, including through increased volunteer participation, and that it is able to do so at a cost significantly less than its benefits. The following sections examine elements that affect the impact of this service.

Second Element: Improving Service Quality

The quality of national service is, of course, directly related to its impact. The Corporation for National and Community Service emphasized the measurement of outcomes from the start and national service programs increasingly focused on community impacts, becoming sophisticated at setting measurable goals and improving the consistency and quality of service they offered.²⁴

¹⁹ *Summary Report: National Evaluation of Learn and Serve America*, Brandeis University Center for Human Resources, 1999, p. 24.

²⁰ *The Benefits and Costs of National Service: Methods for Benefit Assessment with Application to Three AmeriCorps Programs*, George Neumann, R.C. Kormendi, and others, 1995, and *Making a Difference: Impact of AmeriCorps*State/ National Direct on Members and Communities 1994–5 and 1995–6*, Aguirre International, 1999, both as cited in *Fiscal 2003 Budget Estimate and Performance Plan: Activities Authorized by the National and Community Service Act, Submission to Congress*, Corporation for National and Community Service, February 4, 2002, p. 35.

²¹ *Getting Things Done in the Delta: Impacts of the Delta Service Corps, 2001–2002*, Dr. Harrison J. Campbell, Jr., University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, February 2003, pp. 32–40, p.56. Total costs of the program was just over \$3 million, and total value of benefits associated with direct service and member development ranged between \$6.8 million and \$7.4 million. This includes the value of home construction, value of service calculated at entry-level wages, value of volunteer generation, as well as a carefully-isolated value (calculated at 80 percent and 100 percent usage) of the change in lifetime earnings among AmeriCorps Members thanks to the education award, as well as the education awards themselves.

²² *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003, pp.23–4.

²³ *Evaluation of the Washington Service Corps: Final Report*, Abt Associates, September 2000, p. v. and pp. 45–59. To choose one example, the benefits of restoring a local museum were estimated three ways: using the adjusted wage rates for construction workers in the local area; comparison with the "bid price" for the work from a professional contractor; and using estimates of fees associated with increased utilization of the museum. The Washington Service Corps' study, analyzing two site rehabilitations, a program offering after-school tutoring and a safe place for teens to congregate in the evening, and a tutoring, after-school, and summer program initiative run in all of a city's 33 public schools, illustrates why, in a portfolio where each program design rises out of the needs of the local community, it is virtually unimaginable that a set of cost-benefit templates could be created that could encompass all AmeriCorps programs. In addition, it's often dubious to isolate variables; should the tutor, or the teacher, or the homework club coordinator, claim responsibility for the rise in a child's reading scores? In extensive longitudinal studies, so authoritative in some aspects, this is an even more thorny problem. Over ten years, who or what was the critical factor? In addition, economists have begun estimates of the costs of what is avoided by providing at-risk youth with skills and positive social integration into communities. For example, recent studies by Mark Cohen attempt to measure the cost of juvenile violence. (see "Measuring the Costs and Benefits of Crime and Justice," Chapter in Volume 4: Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice (pp. 263–316) Criminal Justice 2000. National Institute of Justice (July 2000), NCJ 182411, available at http://www.ncjrs.org/criminal_justice2000/vol_4/04f.pdf, and "Costs of Juvenile Violence: Policy Implications," (joint with Ted R. Miller and Deborah A. Fisher), *Pediatrics*, vol. 107, no. 1:e3, January 2001, electronic journal available at <http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/107/1/e3>.)

(This was among the key elements distinguishing national service, which sought to provide significant impact on critical social issues, from traditional volunteerism. Historically, nonprofit service providers had expressed anxiety about relying on volunteers for important functions, and experts had stressed the importance of professional training to effective practice in a variety of fields. In addition, volunteer service programs had traditionally focused on the impact of service on the server rather than the impact of service on the community.)

Evidence demonstrates that high program quality with strong impacts were more likely to be the result in national service when programs used three interrelated strategies: strong evaluation methods that reflect on data to further improve impact; effective practices in delivery (research-based tutoring methods, for example); and high quality training and supervision.

The Corporation directed substantial resources toward impact evaluation and the collection and dissemination of dependable assessment practices. In addition, the Corporation, in selected issue areas, set out to develop and then incorporate effective practices for programs addressing those issues.²⁵ One effective practices document, commissioned by the Corporation in 1998, examined which activities and interactions of Foster Grandparents with children in Head Start centers were associated with positive developmental outcomes for children. It also detailed how classroom teachers and program managers could be most effective. The findings were distributed widely so grantees would base training on the materials.²⁶

The Corporation incorporated and improved research-based delivery models in designing national service's largest single initiative to date, a tutoring program launched in 1999 in support of the America Reads program. Through this effort, AmeriCorps*State and National members delivered tutorial assistance in reading to more than 100,000 first- through third-graders. The first year employed a range of models; a study assessed their relative strengths; and the four effective practices formulated by the study were then implemented by the entire program. The tutoring study of 869 children tutored by AmeriCorps members in 68 programs found that students at all grade levels tested improved their reading performance more than the gain expected for the typical child at their grade level. Not

only were the gains statistically significant, they were also large enough to signify real improvement in students' reading abilities.²⁷

Individual programs have also employed research-based practices to maintain their quality of service as they expand. Jumpstart, a program that pairs college work-study college students with preschool children in Head Start and other early education classrooms, expanded rapidly with support from AmeriCorps (in 3 years, it grew from 11 sites to 30) while maintaining impact quality, as documented by annual independent quantitative evaluations. Its part-time members, using research-based methods, have achieved significant program effects on the participating preschool-age children's language, social, and adaptive skills through "a comprehensive package of training, curriculum, and assessment

²⁴ For example, the NSSC created Programming for Impact, which shifted the traditional paradigm from a singular focus on the volunteer (accomplishments were a byproduct) to a dual focus that examined both what got done and how the volunteer developed. This method added a new element—impact—to planning for volunteers. In the typical volunteer program model, emphasis was placed on the interests of the volunteers and a wide variety of activities were created from which volunteer could choose. The impact element places emphasis on community needs and asks what kind of volunteer, with what skills, and how many will be needed to have a demonstrable result. The new model drives recruitment, training, organization (type of leadership and management style) according to what is needed to motivate and support effort. Rather than ignoring the needs of the volunteer, this model is based on the theory that contemporary volunteers find meaning and purpose in accomplishing something valuable. Interview with Tom Endres, former director of NSSC, 30 April 2003.

²⁵ One of the first guidance documents produced for the AmeriCorps*State/National programs was *Principles for High Quality National Service Programs*, April 1994, a widely-circulated, widely-read, and much-quoted booklet articulating the Corporation's expectations for excellence in each area of program design and execution. Today, AmeriCorps's dual training and technical assistance (T/TA) strategy enlists both national T/TA providers who covered key areas including evaluation and specific subject matter like tutoring. It also attempted, through funding to state commissions and state offices, to strengthen program and state commission ability to assess needs, access local resources and effective practices, and evaluate outcomes. Providers adapted research-based effective practices in training and materials, making them work within the context of national service program models. To make the most of the investment in evaluation and formulation of effective practices at the program level, the Corporation promoted peer exchange; grantees and subgrantees were encouraged to share innovation and lessons learned.

²⁶ *Foster Grandparents in Head Start Centers: Benefits for Children, Classrooms, and Centers*, Westat, 1998, pp. 10, 19, 21. Effective practices included such practical, simple, and effective habits as giving every child in the classroom undivided attention at one time or another over the course of a day, and structuring activities so that a child can experience success.

²⁷ *AmeriCorps Tutoring Outcomes Study*, Abt Associates, February 2001, pp. i-v., pp. 39-42. Effective practices were: (1) Tutoring sessions occur at least three times a week; (2) Tutors receive training both prior to and during the course of the tutoring; (3) Program is at least moderately or fully implemented; (4) Programs evaluate the effectiveness of their tutoring activities (p. 42).

strategies for both summer and school year programs.”

The program identifies strong outcomes as first among several reasons why they have been able to gain and retain (they have lost only one out of 34 sites) significant support for the program. “We deliver strong outcomes, we deliver Federal work-study opportunities, we work with pre-school children (which universities have had a hard time effectively serving), we have prestigious corporate partners, we give strong support on core functions and non-core functions, and we’re good grant managers and good long-distance managers,” says Robert Giannino, Vice President of Business Development and Government Relations.²⁸

Other national service programs have similarly demonstrated the ability to deliver high quality service. An extensive RAND study examined Learn and Serve Higher Education programs, and found a range of positive outcomes: measurable gains in test scores were attributable to student tutors; a community health needs assessment by medical students provided the foundation for an organization’s health planning; students pursuing Substance Abuse Counseling and Law Enforcement degrees, volunteering at a residential facility for juvenile offenders, provided counseling and supervised community service activities; conflict mediation services provided by law and pre-law students improved the learning environment in middle and high schools.²⁹

The RAND findings are especially of interest given Learn and Serve’s overall emphasis on participant outcomes rather than impact on recipients of service. Lori Senese, who manages Frostburg State University’s Learn and Serve Higher Education program in rural Maryland, explains this apparent contradiction by connecting strong service outcomes directly to participant growth. “I’ve been a volunteer coordinator, and volunteering is great, but this is not volunteering. Service-learning is serious; the student needs to have the same commitment to academic goals in the service setting as he has in the classroom. They aren’t learning if the children they tutor don’t learn. In addition,” she adds, “if community development isn’t as important as participant development, you lose your partners. All the time I’m thinking, I’ve got to protect my sites. I’ve got to protect my kindergartens. Service and learning have to be equal.”³⁰ So, according to Senese, her participants achieve their goals only by delivering high-quality

impact to service recipients — and she is more likely to retain agency partners when outcomes are strong.

In addition to delivering high quality services, some national service programs have played a role in enabling professional service providers to enhance the quality of their programs. For example, in the child care field, Plus Time New Hampshire AmeriCorps members organize information and education events for child care program staff while AmeriCorps members serving through the National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies’ Action for Children Today (ACT) program in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, provide educational release time for teachers participating in an early childhood scholarship program. In the field of independent living, a study of the Senior Companion Program found that the older volunteers provided a vital communication link between clients and professional staff. Senior Companions served as client advocates, notified staff of changes in client behavior, functioned as “eyes and ears” of the agency, and communicated with family members on behalf of the agency.³¹

Finally, it is worth noting that the studies addressing quality of service describe programs that have strong systems for training and supervising national service participants, which add to the cost per participant. Rigorous research-based practices and assessment systems that contribute to program improvement are not possible to incorporate without training and quality control throughout the term of service. In addition, studies indicate that in some cases, resource limitations and uncertainties regarding AmeriCorps funding have stressed their ability to hire and retain quality staff, and to raise the funding they need to sustain the program.³² Although the day-to-day and strategic control of national service programs takes place at the local level, federal resources and priorities have a significant impact on the quality of service delivered.

²⁸ www.jstart.org/about. See also *The Evaluation of Jumpstart in 2000–2001* and *The Evaluation of Jumpstart During 1999–2000*. Conversation with Robert Giannino of Jumpstart, April 11, 2003.

²⁹ *Coupling Service and Learning in Higher Education: The Final Report of the Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program*, RAND Education, May 1998, pp. 88–89, 94.

³⁰ Interview with Lori Senese, Frostburg State College, April 20, 2003.

³¹ *The Role and Value of Senior Companions in their Communities*, Research Triangle Institute, 2003, p. iii.

Third Element: Increasing Agency Collaboration

From the outset, the Corporation for National and Community Service required that its program grantees involve community partners, local resources, and local direction. As AmeriCorps grew, so did its ability to foster community partnerships; the number of organizations involved with the average AmeriCorps program increased from 10 involved organizations in 1994–5 to 23 sponsoring institutions in 1998–9. These included for-profits, federal, state, and local agencies, and non-profits, including community organizations, educational institutions, and foundations.³³

Tapping local resources and benefiting from local direction was not the only positive consequence of these partnerships. Collaboration among organizations improved. Experts interested in service delivery, non-profit effectiveness, and efficient use of resources believe that collaboration can play a key role in improvement. Increasingly, agencies attempt to coordinate services among agencies, augment the range of services provided, and bring what's needed closer to the consumers, who may lack transportation or a work schedule that enables them to make appointments during business hours. Toward this end, mental health professionals might work in juvenile justice facilities, school fairs might include health screenings, and after-school programs might offer computer training. Integrating services across agencies, however, while commonly regarded as a best practice, routinely face a string of obstacles "such as 'the ubiquitous problems of institutional deficiencies, resource constraints, communication gaps, authority, and turf issues.'"³⁴

Over the past ten years, AmeriCorps appears to have played a useful role in bringing agencies together in coordinated service delivery. For example, a homeless coalition used its AmeriCorps members to help form collaborative partnerships with more than 40 other organizations. As a result, it raised awareness of homelessness issues among other service area providers, connected homeless clients to other social service or community-wide agencies, and, incidentally, motivated providers to streamline existing program management systems. AmeriCorps appears to have been similarly successful at strengthening links between schools, community organizations, and businesses, organizing

referral networks, bringing together organizations that did not usually work together, and improving services by eliminating interagency bottlenecks.³⁶

A comprehensive 1999 study by Aguirre International, looking at a wide cross-section of AmeriCorps programs, found that two out of three institutions involved with AmeriCorps members felt that the program fostered active community collaboration between their agency and other institutions, and three out of four thought that AmeriCorps was doing a good job helping community organizations work together. Nearly 70 percent felt that AmeriCorps had done a very good job at changing the ways in which organizations worked together to provide direct services.³⁷

In one typical instance, AmeriCorps members placed at various community agencies developed a neighborhood improvement plan, linking beneficiaries of one agency with supplies and tools at another agency to develop a clean-up and fence-building project that improved the appearance of the neighborhood and reduced loitering. The Aguirre study found that one improvement leads to another: "a trash collection activity paves the way for a community-wide recycling effort; the effort to teach one parenting class leads to an on-going and productive association between community outreach programs and the community's schools."³⁸ The Aguirre study also observed that as programs became more sophisticated in their relations with their partners, communities improve their abilities to recognize opportunities to make the most of scarce resources by centralizing costly

³² *A Comprehensive Assessment — AmeriCorps: Getting Good Things Done in Northern California*, BTW Consultants, 1999.

³³ *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International, n.d. (September 1999), p.22.

³⁴ *Together We Can: A Guide for Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services*, Atelia I. Melaville and Martin J. Blank with Galareh Asayesh, US Department of Education and US Department of Health and Human Services, 1993, p. 2, quoting Robert L. Crowson and William Lowe Boyd, *Coordinating Services for Children*, 1992. The study summarizes a "pro-family system" as comprehensive; preventive; family centered and family driven; integrated; developmental; flexible; sensitive to race, culture, gender, and individuals with disabilities; and outcomes oriented (p.13).

³⁵ *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International, n.d. (September 1999), p.23.

³⁶ *The AmeriCorps*National/Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International, 1999, pp. 25–6. Only 4 percent felt that AmeriCorps programs needed development in helping organizations work together.

³⁷ *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International, n.d. (September 1999), p.26.

operations while decentralizing program design and implementation.

Energy Express, an AmeriCorps*State program based in the Extension Service at West Virginia University, is an example of a program that coordinates services. Out of a single location — school buildings left vacant during the summer months when this program operates — Energy Express delivers: tutoring (which results in an average gain of one month in word identification, three months in passage comprehension, and 3.5 months in overall reading); parent education (in how to support children's learning, in family nutrition, and in parenting skills); and nutrition for more than 2,800 children annually. Each site partners with at least five organizations. Funding proposals can be made only by a community coalition of parents, groups and organizations, which generates a required local match and fills a variety of support roles, resulting in program expansion with ensured shared ownership, diversified funding, and program sustainability at each site.³⁹

The Mississippi Delta Service Corps explicitly uses its corps members to create a network that identifies needs and resources, stimulates service coordination and shared projects — eliminating service duplication in a region where resources are few. It accomplishes this by requiring that each member attend the meetings of at least two other care providers in the area. The corps members also meet regularly with one another. The result is that the group has current information about what the needs are and where the resources are. When a need arises, they are able to quickly identify and bring in the person who can help, whether it is a fellow corps member trained to give anti-tobacco workshops or an agency with strong HIV/AIDS resources. In 2001–2002, the DSC in Mississippi created 55 partnerships among community organizations to address local needs.⁴⁰

AmeriCorps members are central to the service coordination strategy of the California Alliance for Prevention Corps, an AmeriCorps*State programs. Initially developed in Sacramento County, CAPC worked with at-risk children and their families, providing child abuse prevention services using home visitation and family resource centers. After the 1997 deaths of two Sacramento county children, and the resulting public outcry, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors mandated the creation of a broad-based community

collaborative to address the issues with a preventive strategy.⁴¹

The resulting program philosophy and design, which emphasized community involvement and cross-agency collaboration, fit well with the national service program model, which requires community partners and encourages community involvement.⁴² In the program, AmeriCorps home visitors, after assessing need and establishing trust with the families, meet regularly with integrated multi-disciplinary teams who provide counsel and services. The team members vary depending on the needs and resources of each county, but are likely to include representation from child protective services, mental health counseling and emergency resources, public health providers, WIC professionals, domestic violence counselors, family economic and self-sufficiency support, literacy services, and substance abuse treatment professionals.⁴³

Strong impact data — child abuse and neglect were reduced by 71 percent in year one and 69 percent in year two — attracted partners and enabled the program

³⁸ *AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report*, Aguirre International, n.d. (September 1999), p.30.

³⁹ <http://www.energyexpress.wvu.edu/> In addition to delivering high-quality service, mentors and volunteer coordinators at each site develop a group service project aimed at an identified community need—reading aloud for children at a local library, building a playground that is open and safe. Also, parents are involved as volunteers, contributing an average of 750 volunteer hours per site.

⁴⁰ *Getting Things Done in the Delta: Impacts of the Delta Service Corps, 2001–2002*, Dr. Harrison J. Campbell, Jr., University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, February 2003, p.13. The Corps also reports strong impact data: 4,512 students improved grades or increased reading ability by at least one grade level; 1,226 parents reported improved parenting skills and became more involved in their children's education; 450 adults receiving instruction improved literacy skills by at least one grade level, 16 homes built, work continued on 6 more, living conditions improved for 943 families; 1,507 students and 457 teachers were taught basic computer literacy skills in low resource schools and communities. 2,519 computers were refurbished (p.13). This section also draws on interviews with Andrew Jones, Director DSC, and Deborah Moore of the Mississippi DSC, April 23, 2003.

⁴¹ *Stories from the Heart*, Child Abuse Prevention Council of Sacramento, March 2001, pp. A-5–6

⁴² CAPC believes, first, that because child abuse is caused by multiple factors, it is essential to gain the commitment of the entire community as well as obtain sufficient resources to fund prevention programs. Second, when service providers come from and live in the communities they serve, both they and the residents of the community benefit and communities are strengthened. Third, effective comprehensive prevention programs address the way in which service needs are identified and how services are structured and delivered so that community residents and families are involved and empowered.

to extend through existing social service delivery systems in a variety of settings (urban, rural, suburban, in a range of ethnic and racial communities). By 2003, CAPC placed 379 AmeriCorps members in 140 community-based programs in eighteen California counties.⁴⁴ More than two thousand families received home visitation services, seven thousand family members were served by home visits, nearly 20 thousand referrals and linkages to other services were made, 35,000 intensive services were produced through Family Resource Centers, nearly 400 educational classes were presented to 17,500 individuals, and nearly 400 community events such as health fairs, holiday celebrations, and safety awareness events were provided to nearly 50,000 participants.⁴⁵ This program shows promise for replication on a national scale.

CAPC's independent study suggests that national service enabled agencies to deliver services closer to the consumer: CAPC AmeriCorps members were reported to provide increased access to preventive services because they were not bound by bureaucratic requirements or caseload quotas. The willingness of members to provide services to families at night and on weekends increased access to families working full-time. Community outreach, a mainstay of the members' activity, was cited by the majority of counties as the number one reason host sites increased client caseloads.⁴⁶

AmeriCorps*VISTA has had a long-term emphasis on building the capacity of the agencies that host VISTA volunteers. This includes strengthening agencies' ability to collaborate. AmeriCorps*VISTA gave critical support to a joint effort by the W.E.B. Du Bois Institute for Afro-American Research at Harvard, Baltimore City Mayor's Office, Bethel A.M.E. Church, the Zion Baptist Church, and the Corporation for National and Community Service to replicate in Baltimore schools a successful Boston-based after-school program. This community-based after-school technology- and content-based education program uses the CD-ROM *Encarta Africana*, to make four million years of African American history come to life to "bridge the digital divide," embedding technology learning within content-rich studies to give students a context and purpose for exercising their developing technical skills.⁴⁷

AmeriCorps*VISTA management, support, and organization made the project possible. VISTAs

identified funding sources, including in-kind support (especially computer give-aways), wrote grant proposals, developed and implemented operational models to make the collaboration run smoothly, served as outreach liaisons to communities, other after-school program managers, faith partners, city government and the Mayor's office, teach in the program, and troubleshoot everyday organizational snags.

AmeriCorps*VISTAs bring organizations together in two very different ways for PlusTime New Hampshire. One strategy is to build collaboration from the top down. The Governor created a Kid's Cabinet where Commissioners and lead administrators involved with children's issues meet regularly to find ways the agencies can join forces. An AmeriCorps*VISTA is the lead staff member coordinating the Cabinet's after-school programming.

PlusTime also brings organizations together at the ground level. For example, at a tutoring and mentoring after-school program site in a low-income apartment complex, an AmeriCorps*VISTA builds capacity, brings in additional volunteers, assesses needs and provides training, working alongside a police officer and a national guard officer, the third member of an inter-agency team.⁴⁸

⁴³ *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003, pp. 5-9. AmeriCorps members use home visitation models that are structured, intensive, supervised by professionals, and operated in tandem with resource center activities. The models are based on the belief that the family is the best place to raise children and that overburdened families require a coordinated, sustained, and intense period of support in order to learn how to function independently. Practices include those tested by Healthy Families America; the Nurse Home Visitation Program in Elmira, NY and Memphis, TN; models funded by the Packard Foundation; a 17-year Chicago study; and many California models from around the state, especially *Home Visiting*, a manual developed by a team at UCLA.

⁴⁴ CAPC links with three state agencies, 54 grassroots organizations, 33 faith-based groups, eight private sector partners, 66 schools, 32 school-based programs, and a total of 143 community-based family-serving and health organizations and public agencies).

⁴⁵ *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003, pp. 24-7.

⁴⁶ *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003, pp. 25.

⁴⁷ The effort is a part of Baltimore Rising, a faith-based, community driven mentoring program aimed toward at-risk youth that gives teenagers options other than drugs and street gangs, sponsored by Mayor Martin O'Malley, and developed in consultation with city leaders, John Dilulio, then at the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and Reverend Rivers of the Azusa Faith Community in Boston and his 10 Point Coalition.

Although collaboration is not an end in itself, it is a means to improve service delivery and ensure that resources are put to their best use. Many AmeriCorps*State and National and AmeriCorps*VISTA members may bring to the task the ability to work across cultural and organizational lines, without preconceived notions about “how things have always been done.” Through their long-term, full-time commitment, they are able to perform the time-intensive work of building coalitions, coordinating efforts, and conciliating competing agendas. These qualities offer agencies some of the capacities critical to building and sustaining successful collaborations, and may well contribute to AmeriCorps’ ability to “get things done.”

Fourth Element: Exposing Young People to Careers in Fields Experiencing Shortages

Teach for America, which recruits college graduates into hard-to-fill teaching positions, is the most prominent AmeriCorps grantee identified with attracting talented young people to serve in shortage-plagued professions. However, participants from many other national service programs find that their service experience has a significant impact on their interest in working in underserved fields. For example, Learn and Serve Higher Education initiatives can be viewed as practicum, building knowledge and skills of the students who serve in the community. Many of Frostburg State’s Learn and Serve participants choose to serve in kindergartens because they want to be elementary school teachers. Even elementary and secondary students may be influenced by their service experiences to think about or learn more about a future career or job.⁴⁹

The intensive experience of AmeriCorps lends itself to career exploration, and for some fields, is emerging as a strategy to attract qualified individuals into a profession. For example, a survey of alumni of the National Association for Child Care and Referral (NACCR-RA)’s Action for Children Today (ACT) AmeriCorps program indicated that 70 percent of the program’s working alumni were involved in child care.⁵⁰ This result is particularly significant given widespread shortages for qualified child care staff, and the fact that most ACT members were recruited from outside the

child care field; their experience in the program inspired them to remain in the profession. Three out of four alumni still in the child care field indicated that being an ACT member influenced their career choice; nine in ten reported that their ACT experience definitely or somewhat helped them to obtain their present job.

The opportunity to explore future job and educational interests is the second most common reason given for joining AmeriCorps.⁵¹ Abt Associates’ 2001 study of AmeriCorps members at baseline, the initial phase of a study that plans to determine the effects of participation of AmeriCorps on members, reports that members explore their possibilities with a marked self-confidence. Their self-efficacy — belief in their ability to accomplish activities — is relatively high in civic involvement, in education, and in employment attainment.⁵²

Many participants, including older members seeking a change in career⁵³ intentionally choose national service as a kind of vocational laboratory; even before the term of service they are attracted to the field. Others become drawn to the work as they serve. In one study, participants’ desire to work in a job where they “can help others” rose from 44 percent at the outset to 75 percent after the term of service.⁵⁴ (This doesn’t necessarily mean they will continue doing exactly the same work. For example, several Washington Reading Corps participants left wanting to become not teachers but social workers.⁵⁵)

⁴⁸ Interview with Cynthia Billings, April 23, 2003.

⁴⁹ *Summary Report: National Evaluation of Learn and Serve America*, Brandeis University Center for Human Resources, 1999, p. 14.

⁵⁰ *The Impact of AmeriCorps Service on ACT Alumni*, AmeriCorps Action for Children Today, NACCRA, March 2003, p.1. 68 percent work directly with children in early childhood or out-of-school time programs, 22 percent work in the area of child care resource and referral, and 10 percent are in an administrative/other role.

⁵¹ *A Profile of AmeriCorps Members at Baseline*, Abt Associates, June 2001, p. 28

⁵² *A Profile of AmeriCorps Members at Baseline*, Abt Associates, June 2001, p. 27

⁵³ Washington State’s Reading Corps included a former truck driver, looking for a change in his career; job opportunities were dwindling for him in the small northeast border town where he lived, so he served at a local elementary school and planned to serve a second year while exploring additional options in education for the future. *Washington Reading Corps: Impacts of National Service and the Community: 1999–2000*, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, October 2000, p. 15.

⁵⁴ *Evaluation of the Washington Service Corps*, Abt Associates, September 2000, p. 43.

National service often draws on populations with ties to underserved areas, a strategy often cited by experts concerned with recruiting and retaining professionals to work in low-income rural and urban communities. For example, one New Orleans Yes!AmeriCorps member who was recruited from the apartment complex, is now a Family Literacy Instructor. “He didn’t have to leave the community,” says AmeriCorps Director Ifama Arsan. “We didn’t have to lose him.” “He’s now seen as a strong and vibrant local leader,” comments YMCA Director Lou C. Johnson, adding, “Not all of our members are eminently qualified, but all of them are ultimately qualifiable.”⁵⁶

The California Alliance for Prevention Corps (CAPC) also recruits members from the communities served. Eighty percent of their members, according to an independent study, had public assistance backgrounds, and most were mothers with no successful work experience. “We work hard to retain our members,” says Sheila Anderson, the project’s Director. “Not everyone here has a great work history. They haven’t done well with schools, with authority. So if that’s what your people have failed at, why use that model? So, we don’t supervise, we coach. And we train people on site to watch for that moment when it looks like the member is getting fed up, getting ready to quit — and before they leave, they have to deal with us. That’s one of the things that we do out of the Sacramento office. We come down and intervene, and again and again, the idea that persuades them to stay is the fact that this is not a job, this is service. This is something they are doing for other people, women like themselves, with families like theirs. They’re becoming role models. And that’s what makes them stay.”⁵⁷

CAPC has a 98 percent retention rate with its members, and 100 percent of the members who have left early or at the end of their term of service go on to better employment or, helped by connections through the program, return to school for additional education.⁵⁸ The high retention rate adds significant quality to the service delivery; high turnover in family services is one of the reasons for mediocre quality, lack of coordinated services, and an eroding of the trust that underlies effective home visiting and case management.

When programs like New Orleans’ Yes!AmeriCorps and CAPC recruit and support members locally, members not only stay in the profession, but stay in their home

communities, reversing the brain drain and creating professionals able to tap networks impenetrable to outsiders lacking connection to local culture or even local language. For example, a Hmong-American CAPC alumni working at a Family Resource Center in Fresno has increased the number of Hmong families served by approximately 70%.⁵⁹

For these strategically valuable recruits, the living allowance, health care, and child care benefits make service possible and the AmeriCorps education award makes the next step of professional training imaginable.

Finally, although studies provide some evidence linking service experiences to careers in service professions, no effort exists on a national scale to encourage these pathways. The significant potential represented by the participants and alumni of national service programs therefore remains underdeveloped and under examined by research.

Recommendations for Next Steps

National service is “getting things done” in four key areas. Over the past ten years, it has expanded local programs and services; improved service quality; increased agency collaboration; and exposed people to careers in fields experiencing shortages, including education, child care, and family services. In some cases, these results have been enhanced through deliberate strategies at the federal level; in others, they have emerged through the innovative, and often isolated, efforts of individual local programs.

⁵⁵ *Washington Reading Corps: Impacts of National Service and the Community: 1999–2000*, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, October 2000, pp. 35–46. One participant, a high school dropout, single mother of three daughters, and 16 year veteran of welfare, was relocating her family and going to college: “I have chosen to go into social work as I saw a real need for social help in the communities that I served.” In addition, this woman’s oldest daughter, seeing her mother’s transformation—“learning new things, teaching others, preparing to go back to school”—followed her example, joining AmeriCorps upon graduating—a year early—from high school.

⁵⁶ Interview with Lou C. Johnson and Ifama Arsan, Yes!AmeriCorps, April 24, 2003.

⁵⁷ Interview with Sheila Anderson, Director, California Alliance for Prevention, March and April 2003.

⁵⁸ *Stories from the Heart: AmeriCorps: A Stepping Stone to a Better Place*, Child Abuse Prevention Council of Sacramento, Inc., citing evaluation by Harder & Co., March 2001, p. ii.

⁵⁹ *California Alliance for Prevention: Second Year Evaluation Report*, March 2003, p. 26.

To maximize the potential of national service, Congress and the Federal Corporation, as well as states, private funders, public and private agencies, and faith-based networks delivering services, should consider providing support for promising efforts. This support might include:

A. Encouraging the replication of programs with strong research-based practices and strong impact data. Strategies include:

- Expanding funding for AmeriCorps*National, which by design, encourages the replication of program models in more than one state;
- Designating AmeriCorps*State funds for state-based programs replicating successful program models from other states;
- Promoting service as a strategy among policy-makers in all areas where service has successfully delivered high impact, strong member development, and community collaboration;
- Funding challenge grants to enable effective programs to expand into new sites; and
- Promoting service as a strategy by routinely including it as a mode of delivery in public, private, and faith-based systems.

D. Continuing to enhance quality through:

- Supporting research-based effective practices;
- While supporting replication, also ensuring funding for new and innovative solutions using service;
- Preserving local control, despite the fact that this makes it difficult to aggregate or compare program accomplishments; on balance, it appears necessary;
- Creating opportunities and networks for programs working on similar issues to learn from one another, and from experts on the issues outside the national service field; and
- Supporting the cost of quality to ensure that organizations have the capacity to:
 - recruit, train, supervise, and retain national service participants;

- identify and develop research-based practices by evaluating impact and improving program models as a result of what they have learned;
- work effectively in collaboration.

E. Taking advantage of the large and growing network of national service alumni to expand the pool of professionals in fields experiencing shortages. Strategies include:

- Providing funding for a national alumni association that is able to connect alumni with training and career opportunities;
- Encouraging partnerships between AmeriCorps and institutions of higher learning that offer professional training in targeted fields;
- Encouraging the development of new professional corps programs; and
- Formalizing pathways from service to career through innovative programs.

Finally, to build these networks and systems, AmeriCorps and other national service programs require a stable funding base that includes support not just for programs, but also education awards, benefits, training, evaluation, and recruitment. While the uncertainties of the federal and state budget processes present obvious challenges, they also impose a cost on local programs struggling to raise matching funds, make commitments to potential participants, retain staff, and build strong local partnerships. Minimizing this cost through strong, stable support would go a long way toward enabling the program to maximize its effectiveness.

The laboratory of the past ten years has provided a range of cost-effective solutions with multiple benefits to communities. Working with many partners, including community agencies, service providers and educators, federal, state, and local government, volunteers, houses of worship, and Americans of all ages, national service has demonstrated a multitude of practical solutions for our most pressing social issues. In the next decade, these practical solutions could be replicated in communities across the country.

National and Community Service: Getting Things Done to Promote Positive Youth Development During Out of School Time

by Shirley Sagawa

Executive Summary

The positive development of young people, particularly during adolescence, depends on the acquisition of personal and social “assets” that promote their physical, intellectual, and social development. These assets include good health habits, school success, decision making skills, positive self-regard, the ability to plan for the future, a sense of a larger purpose in life, strong relationships with peers, parents, and other adults, the ability to navigate in diverse cultural contexts, and a commitment to civic engagement.

The lack of assets correlates with a score of risky behaviors – from tobacco, drug, or alcohol abuse to early sexual behavior. These problems cut across economic lines, but in most cases, are more prevalent among the eleven million youth who live in poverty in America.

Many, but not all of the assets youth need can be provided by loving and supportive families. Schools, faith-based organizations, youth-serving organizations, and other community programs play an important role in helping youth of all backgrounds develop, and are particularly important to youth whose families are unwilling or unable to provide for them. Programs beneficial to youth are often structured to promote physical and psychological safety; provide supportive relationships and opportunities to belong; encourage positive social norms and skill building; empower youth by allowing them to make a difference in the community and be taken seriously; and integrate family, school, and community efforts.

Unfortunately, too many youth are unconnected to these positive learning environments because programs are unavailable or unaffordable, are of poor quality, or offer limited services and opportunities. At the same time, while they are thought of as recipients of service, youth are rarely given the opportunity to serve others, despite the positive benefits of service.

National and community service programs are playing a significant role in improving the quantity and quality of programs for youth, and could be even more effective with thoughtful collaboration by the service and youth development fields. National and community service participants:

- Expand youth programs by staffing out of school time programs or other youth-serving programs.
- Improve staff quality by exposing talented young people to the youth field; organizing education and training events for staff; providing incentives, such as education awards, that encourage professionals to enter shortage professions; and freeing professional staff from routine or administrative tasks.
- Serve as tutors and mentors working one-on-one with students needing extra support.
- Increase the range of services available through schools, youth centers, and afterschool programs, such as recreation programs, support groups, computer help, arts workshops, conflict resolution training, and clubs.
- Recruit and organize other community members to volunteer with youth.

- Provide youth with opportunities to serve by leading younger students in service.
- Can become lifelong advocates for positive youth policies.

Policymakers and programs in both the youth and service fields can do much to strengthen opportunities for mutually beneficial partnerships. Together, youth development and national service advocates could embrace common goals, such as:

- Making a summer of service a rite of passage for every eighth grader.
- Building partnerships to expand the range of offerings through youth programs.
- Build better pathways from national service to careers in youth-serving professions.
- Expand the number of advocates for positive youth policy.

National and community service presents a powerful but underutilized resource to expand and improve programs for youth that will increase their chances of success. At the same time, involving youth in service also pays benefits; when young people understand that they can improve the lives of others, they feel able to control their own lives in a positive way. Stronger collaboration between the service and youth development communities offers many potential benefits for both fields, and for youth.

Introduction

Half a world a way, in the township of Soweto, South Africa, nearly 100 children spend their afternoons each weekday with “Mama Jackey” Maarohanye at the Ithuteng Trust. On Saturday, their numbers swell to nearly 1,000 — far too many to hold in the two classrooms on campus; they meet in circles sitting outdoors on the hard dirt. Mama Jackey, a teacher and the only professional employee of the Trust, relies on her older students, some of whom are now in college, to teach the younger students everything from biology and math to physical education and French. With this extra afterschool help, one hundred percent of Mama Jackey’s students pass the matriculation exam required at the

end of high school — an extraordinary feat for any group of students in this economically impoverished community with its violent history.

What is even more astonishing is the make-up of the student body at Ithuteng. Mama Jackey handpicks her students, not for their skills, but their needs. Her students have lost their parents to violence, been victims of rape and incest, or perpetrated violent crimes themselves. Their principals pointed them out as the most difficult children in their schools; others were released from jail into Mama Jackey’s care. Because they cannot go home, fifty of the children live at the school, sleeping end to end on floor mats in a building the size of a two-car garage.

For visitors, the students put on elaborate African dances and prepare a typical meal of “pap” (a grits-like starch) and chicken stew. The students show off their hand-cultivated garden and free-roaming livestock, and proudly guide visitors through eight traditional houses they built by hand in the style of each of the major South African tribes. They are proud of the volunteer work they do at a nearby center for disabled children, and show the room where they take youth crisis hotline calls from teenagers across the country who have been victimized or are contemplating suicide. Ithuteng youth are drug- and alcohol-free, unfailingly polite and friendly, and able to explain the values that underlie their program — Love, Trust, Respect, Responsibility, Discipline, and Behavior Modeling. Visitors leave not pitying these children who have so little, but admiring them for doing so much with what they have.

What youth need

What youth need, according to the National Academy of Sciences’ Board on Children, Youth, and Families — a panel of highly credentialed experts who consider only scientific evidence in formulating their collective opinion — are about two-dozen personal and social “assets” that promote positive youth development. While youth do not necessarily need all the assets listed, experts agree that more assets are better than fewer. The NAS list includes:

Physical development

- Good health habits
- Good health risk management skills

Intellectual development

- Knowledge of essential life skills
- Knowledge of essential vocational skills
- School success
- Rational habits of mind — critical thinking and reasoning skills
- In-depth knowledge of more than one culture
- Good decision-making skills
- Knowledge of skills needed to navigate through multiple cultural contexts

Psychological and emotional development

- Good mental health including positive self-regard
- Good emotional self-regulation skills
- Good coping skills
- Good conflict resolution skills
- Mastery motivation and positive achievement motivation
- Confidence in one's personal efficacy
- "Planfulness" — planning for the future and future life events
- Sense of personal autonomy/responsibility for self
- Optimism couple with realism
- Coherent and positive personal and social identity
- Prosocial and culturally sensitive values
- Spirituality or a sense of a "larger" purpose in life
- Strong moral character
- A commitment to good use of time

Social development

- Connectedness — perceived good relationships and trust with parents, peers, and some other adults
- Sense of social place/integration — being connected and valued by larger social networks
- Attachment to prosocial/conventional institutions, such as school, church, nonschool youth programs
- Ability to navigate in multiple cultural contexts
- Commitment to civic engagement

Other experts use similar lists with more or fewer categories — America's Promise, for example, collapses the list into just five "promises" based on the Search Institute's much longer list of 40 developmental assets.

Many, but not all of these assets can be provided by loving and supportive families. Where families are unwilling or unable to provide them, as with the children of Ithuteng, schools, faith-based organizations, youth-serving organizations, and other community programs all play an important role in helping youth of all backgrounds develop.

While it is easy to characterize Ithuteng as an after-school enrichment program focused on school success, in fact it addresses each major category of assets — teaching youth about their own culture and that of others; encouraging prosocial skills and conflict management; building their self-esteem and sense of purpose; teaching good health habits and marketable skills; and fostering a powerful sense of connectedness to the institution, Mama Jackey, and one another. And because it relies on older youth volunteers to teach the younger students, supervise their activities, and staff the youth crisis hotline, Ithuteng offers a powerful international example of service that "gets things done" in youth development.

America's challenges and opportunities

Like South Africa, the United States is a country of diverse people and profound contrasts. Many American children have the good fortune of economic security, supportive parents, good schools, and community connections. Others, however, face challenges that prevent them from developing the "assets" they need to succeed.

The lack of assets correlates with a score of risky behaviors — from tobacco, drug, or alcohol abuse to early sexual behavior. Although the 1990s saw some positive developments for youth — a modest reduction in births to teen mothers and a decline in smoking and violence among teens — these problems and others remain at unacceptably high levels. Half a million youth aged 12 to 17 are victims of violent crime each year; one in two high school youth is sexually active — with one in twelve reporting having sex before the age of 13. One in seven tenth graders smokes every day; one

in four twelfth graders and one in six eighth graders abuse alcohol. One in four high school youth, and one in eight eighth graders use illegal drugs. One in ten young people fails to complete high school; more than 1.4 million older teens are neither in school nor working. While these problems cut across economic lines, virtually all of these problems are more prevalent among the eleven million children and youth who live in poverty in America today.

The National Academy of Sciences recognizes the important role that community organizations play in the lives of many youth by expanding “the opportunities for youth to acquire personal and social assets and to experience the broad range of features of positive developmental settings.... Adolescents who spend time in communities that are rich in developmental opportunities for them experience less risk and show evidence of higher rates of positive development.” Those that play a beneficial role are structured programs that promote physical and psychological safety; provide supportive relationships and opportunities to belong; encourage positive social norms and skill building; empower youth by allowing them to make a difference in the community and be taken seriously; and integrate family, school, and community efforts.

Unfortunately, despite the important role that youth programs can play, too many youth are unconnected to these learning environments. Challenges include:

- Limited programs during out-of-school time, a particular problem for many young people and their working families. Experts note that as many as 15 million children have no place to go at the end of the school day and school year, leaving them exposed to unnecessary risk and without opportunities to use this time productively. Afterschool and summer child care programs are scarce in many communities, while programs for teenagers, who are too old for child care, are often nonexistent.
- Even when programs are available, their quality may be weak, with poorly trained or too few staff, inadequate resources, and unsafe facilities. Instead of offering an enriching experience, these programs may be unmotivating, or even harmful.
- In addition to a safe place to spend time, young people need access to a range of services and opportunities that are often unavailable. Youth

programs are a good place for to offer these services — from technology training and exposure to career options to drug counseling and health care.

- Family involvement is a strong indicator of youth success, but work schedules and complicated demands of life may make it difficult for families to participate in the lives of youth.
- Youth benefit greatly from serving others, but too often, are thought of only as recipients of service. When young people see that they are able to improve the lives of others, they feel able to control their own lives in a positive way, avoiding risk behaviors, strengthening their community connections, and becoming more engaged in their own education.

Responding to these challenges demands expanded efforts by youth organizations, local governments, schools, and faith-based institutions to play larger roles in helping youth acquire the assets they need. These entities, in turn, require additional resources, both human and financial, from a variety of sources — from the grassroots efforts of families and community members to dollars that could be made available by state and federal policymakers.

National and community service is a resource that has often been overlooked by the youth development field. In fact, however, service programs are playing a significant role in the lives of many American youth, and could be even more effective with thoughtful collaboration by the service and youth development fields.

How national and community service addresses these challenges

National and community service encompasses a wide range of service programs — from full-time, adult AmeriCorps members to part-time youth or senior volunteers. Many, but not all of these programs receive support through the Corporation for National and Community Service; most are administered by non-profit organizations operating locally or nationally. [See Background Paper on National and Community Service.]

Currently, national service supports youth development in the following ways:

Expanding youth programs

By providing an organizational home and supply of staff, national service programs have increased the availability of youth programs, including youth centers and out-of-school-time care. When organized under the supervision of trained professionals, these programs not only provide safe places for school-age youth during out of school time, but also expose them to young adults who are potential role models. For example:

- Boston-based **Citizen Schools** engages AmeriCorps members and volunteer “citizen teachers” to provide free out-of-school time programs to more than 2000 children aged 9 to 14 in nine cities. Citizen teachers use their own career skills to lead small groups of youth in apprenticeship experiences (such as arguing mock trials in front of federal judges, building solar cars, organizing a 5K road race, or publishing a newspaper), while AmeriCorps Teaching Fellows, who have helped fuel Citizen Schools’ recent expansion from its Boston base, lead learning activities to build writing, data analysis, and oral presentation skills connected to school-day learning.
- Project YES AmeriCorps members serving with **East Bay Conservation Corps** provide classroom, after-school, weekend, and summer service-learning programs for 1,300 youth in Oakland, California.
- AmeriCorps members have proven effective in small rural areas that lack resources for program development. **Save the Children’s** Web of Support program deploys 85 AmeriCorps members in mainly rural areas across the country. For example, the entrepreneurial efforts of two AmeriCorps members resulted in the first-ever afterschool program for children in the Owyhee, Nevada, community. In addition to obtaining and preparing a three-bedroom house to house the center, the two AmeriCorps members continue to staff the program, leading three dozen children in traditional Shoshone-Paiute arts activities, computer training, and homework help Monday through Friday from 3:30 to 6:00 pm.

Improving staff quality

National service can help improve the quality of staff in youth programs by:

- exposing talented young people to the youth field;

- organizing education and training events for staff;
- providing incentives, such as education awards, that encourage professionals to enter shortage professions; and
- freeing professional staff from routine or administrative tasks.

Informally, service in AmeriCorps has led many young people to choose careers in the child and youth fields. However, many national service programs have developed creative ways to advance the goal of improving staff quality more directly. For example:

- **Citizen Schools** is partnering with Lesley University to offer its AmeriCorps members and staff a Master’s Degree in education with a specialization in out-of-school time leadership.
- **Plus Time New Hampshire** members organize information and education events for child care program staff.
- **Teach for America**, a professional corps program, provides AmeriCorps educational awards to its teachers, who receive full salaries and benefits from their schools — the educational award of close to \$5,000 serves as an added incentive for the young teachers to work in high-poverty schools that often face teacher shortages.

Action for Children Today (ACT), an AmeriCorps program created by the National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, has had a particularly strong impact on the child care workforce. ACT AmeriCorps Members assist local Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies in expanding the quantity and improving the quality of infant/toddler, preschool, and school-age child care while providing direct service to these age groups. For example, at ACT members in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, provide educational release time for teachers participating in an early childhood scholarship program. Members at this and other sites provide training workshops to child care staff in the communities where they serve.

Most ACT members were recruited from outside the child care field; their experience in the program inspired them to remain in the profession. A survey of alumni found that seven in ten working alumni indicated that they remained in the child care field.

Three out of four alumni still in the child care field indicated that being an ACT member influenced their career choice; nine in ten reported that their ACT experience definitely or somewhat helped them to obtain their present job.

Tutoring youth

Increasing educational opportunities for young people often means providing extra support outside of the school day, through tutoring and mentoring programs that give young people one-on-one attention. Using paid staff for this function is beyond the resources of many afterschool programs; trained volunteers and national service participants, however, can provide the extra help that struggling students need.

For example, **Heads Up**, operating in eight locations throughout the District of Columbia, partners with DC public schools and seven universities, to provide out-of-school time programs for youth. Service participants include neighborhood parents and area undergraduates (many of whom are part-time AmeriCorps members) who tutor elementary school students and help middle-school and high-school students prepare for college and careers; teens who serve as junior tutors; and elementary students who design projects that give back to their community. A 1998 evaluation of the program found that 61 percent of students tested at or above grade level on the Stanford 9 achievement tests, up from 46 percent just five months earlier, while 76 percent of participants increased their reading level at least one full grade and 45 percent increased two or more grade levels. Surveys showed that 97 percent of Heads Up parents themselves rated the improvement of their children's attitude about learning as "very good" or "excellent", while 94 percent said that their children's grades had gone up. An added benefit — more than 60 percent of undergraduate tutors say they are considering a career in teaching or public service as a result of their participation in Heads Up.

Other programs have been similarly successful. **Hands on Atlanta** uses AmeriCorps members to provide an afterschool enrichment program to more than 1300 elementary and middle school students, and administers a Saturday tutorial program at six schools. Hundreds of community volunteers and parents supplement the work of AmeriCorps, delivering one-on-one tutoring

and homework help. The **Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program**, created by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, similarly deploys its AmeriCorps members to tutor children in reading and math and offer afterschool enrichment programs with excellent results — eighty percent of the students tutored improved by one to two grade levels.

A study of AmeriCorps programs engaged in tutoring reading confirmed the effectiveness of this approach — tutored students at all grade levels in the study improved their reading performance from pretest to post-test more than the gain expected for the typical child at their grade level. Reading comprehension and reading skills started out below grade-level; by year-end, students closed the gap and were reading at or near the grade-level expectation.

Increasing the range of services available

Experts have long recommended that services — from health care to computer training — be provided in places where youth are already found, such as schools, youth centers, and afterschool programs. National service programs have enabled youth-serving organizations to offer a broad range of services. For example:

- AmeriCorps members with the **Notre Dame Mission Volunteer Program** in sites across the country have created playgrounds, recreation programs, support groups, a computer science lab, a young mothers club, creative writing group, library program, a performing arts workshop, a credit union, and an out-of-school program for teenage dropouts.
- **Plus Time New Hampshire** AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps*VISTA members engage in activities specifically designed to build youth developmental assets, including helping youth develop skills to resist negative peer pressure and to develop positive views of their personal futures.
- At the **Latin American Youth Center** in Washington, DC, volunteers help to staff recreation programs, tutor and mentor youth, teach art classes, and staff the computer lab while AmeriCorps members coordinate an elementary afterschool program, Teen Drop-in Center, and prevention workshops.
- AmeriCorps members with **Civic Works**, a Baltimore-based youth corps, assist students at ten

afterschool centers with homework, service projects, cultural activities, computers, and other educationally enriching activities.

- **Rochester AmeriCorps** members based at Monroe Community College in western New York, serve at two-dozen local agencies, where their responsibilities include running an inner-city Girl Scout troop, teaching conflict resolution, supervising computer clubs, and organizing service projects for youth.
- AmeriCorps members with **Harlem Children's Zone** provide conflict resolution training, offer crisis support to families, developed a community technology center, and improve the physical environment of the Harlem Children's Zone.
- In partnership with organizations such as Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Volunteers of America, and local YMCAs, **Experience Corps** recruits older Americans to volunteers in schools and other youth organizations. In addition to tutoring, providing classroom assistance, and helping with after-school programs, Experience Corps volunteers develop programs for children based on their own unique backgrounds and experiences—from tap dancing classes to a student mail delivery service.
- Through the efforts of the **National School and Community Corps**, dozens of Philadelphia schools have become community centers, offering programs for children and adults before school, during school, after school, on Saturdays, and during the summer. By offering more programs and services for parents and adults in the neighborhoods, parental and community involvement in schools has substantially increased and 90% for parents and community members have reported positive change in feelings toward and perceptions of the school and education.

Building community

In her recent book, *Time to Care*, child care expert Joan Lombardi writes about the importance of community involvement in children's programs, calling for every community to "provide many opportunities for everyone to become involved, to share their expertise, to work on behalf of children."

AmeriCorps members have helped to open the door for community members to engage in this work. For

example, the **Amachi** program, run by Public/Private Ventures with AmeriCorps funding through the Mid-Atlantic Network of Youth and Family Services, uses AmeriCorps members placed with churches to recruit mentors for children of imprisoned parents. In addition to their direct service with children, **Plus Time New Hampshire** AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps*VISTA members recruit volunteers to help in afterschool programs. Volunteers tutor, coach sports activities, provide career counsel, and chaperone special events.

Entrepreneurial youth can be particularly effective at mobilizing fellow students. For example, Margaret Reynolds, a freshman at **St. Catherine's School** in Richmond, Virginia, started a "Big Sisters" mentoring program that pairs middle-school girls with at-risk children from a local daycare center. More than two dozen Big Sisters visit their the children every week, working on art projects with them, reading them stories, and lending an ear and a shoulder. The group also plans special events and fundraisers throughout the year. "Not only do the children receive our special attention and affection, but we also feel their love for us in return," said Margaret, who received a Prudential Spirit of Community Award for her efforts.

Providing youth with opportunities to serve

Service-learning programs not only helps to enliven the educational process and improve student motivation and achievement, it also helps youth develop assets such as connectedness, feeling valued, attachment to pro-social institutions, the ability to navigate in multiple cultural contexts, commitment to civic engagement, good conflict resolution and, planning for the future skills, a sense of personal responsibility, strong moral character, self-esteem, confidence in one's personal efficacy, a commitment to good use of time, and a sense of a larger purpose in life. In fact, the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy includes two service-learning models (**Teen Outreach Program** and **Reach for Health Community Youth Service Learning**) on its list of programs that have been proven effective at reducing teen pregnancy.

National service participants are well suited to lead younger students in service. For example, **City Year's** Young Heroes program uses 100 members of its 18 to 24 year-old AmeriCorps members to lead more than 1,000 middle-school age youth in 12 cities in service-

learning activities over 15 Saturdays. A typical Saturday program provides an educational workshop on an issue — such as homelessness or domestic violence — and then engages the youth in a related service project. In addition to providing all the staffing for the program, the young AmeriCorps members serve as positive role models for the “Young Heroes” they lead.

In West Philadelphia, anthropology and environmental studies students from the **University of Pennsylvania** have contributed to the health and nutrition of K-12 students. In addition to teaching nutrition education in elementary, middle, and high schools, the college students engage in community problem solving with their younger counterparts, resulting in a range of innovative service-learning opportunities. Past projects have included a school-based fruit stand, school gardens, a community fitness program, and an urban agriculture business at a local high school.

Peace Games, a national program operating in nine schools, also engages AmeriCorps members and community volunteers to teach conflict resolution and other peacemaking skills to elementary students, and then help students develop “Peacemaker projects.” These service projects are tied to the curriculum themes, with younger students focusing on “helping others”; older elementary students working to make their classroom or neighborhood safer; and middle school students designing service activities that take a stand on community issues.

Creating new advocates for positive youth policies

In the long term, sound policies are needed to bring resources and strategies to benefit children and youth. Individuals who know first hand the challenges facing young people are far more likely to become advocates on their behalf than their unengaged peers. According to Marc Freedman, writing in *Prime Time: How Baby Boomers will Revolutionize Retirement and Transform America*, **older volunteers in Miami schools** made headlines when they spearheaded a campaign to pass a billion-dollar bond issue, which passed with the unprecedented support of 80 percent of the older population, most of whom had grandchildren living elsewhere in the country.

Because of their experience working with young people, exposure to communities in need, and training

in the skills of civic engagement, the volunteers and alumni of national and community service programs could become a potent force for change.¹

Public Allies selects promising young leaders who commit to a ten-month program of full-time, paid apprenticeships in community organizations, team service projects and weekly leadership training. To encourage program alumni to continue their involvement and become advocates, Public Allies offers ongoing training (including a public policy program in the works), opportunities to attend national conferences such as Children’s Defense Fund, Independent Sector, National Community Building Network, and the National Council of LaRaza; and sponsors a private, online network for alumni that includes discussion boards and an “Action” section that allows people to organize each other on public issues by issue-area interests and location. These efforts are paying off — according to a survey of Public Allies alumni, a third have participated in public advocacy and one in six has volunteered on a political campaign. An annual award honors alumni who achieve a significant impact; the first award went to a group of six alumni in Chicago who organized the Little Village Neighborhood to push the Chicago Board of Education to fulfill a promise for a high school in the neighborhood. The campaign culminated in a 19 day Hunger Strike beginning on Mother’s Day 2001, which resulted in \$44 million being released for the school. The alumni have worked since to mobilize residents to design and develop the school.

Another program that has made civic action a priority is **Brown University’s “Children and Public Policy” seminar**, a service-learning course in which political science students are required to work a few hours each week in a state agency dealing with children’s issues.

Recommendations for the future

Together, youth development and national service advocates could embrace common goals:

¹ AmeriCorps members are prohibited from engaging in political activity or lobbying while serving, but can do so on their own time and after they leave the program.

Make a summer of service a rite of passage for every eighth grader.

A summer of service before high school should be a rite of passage for future generations – enabling young people to enter their teenage years with a positive experience that reinforces their connections to the community, enlivens their education, and strengthens their personal and civic values.

The middle school years are pivotal years for young people — a time when young people are making choices that will influence the rest of their lives. How they spend their time during this period may set them on a course of active citizenship and engaged learning, or down a path of risk behavior and likelihood of failure. But government funding for child care and after school programs limits eligibility to children under 13. AmeriCorps members must be 18, and only limited funding is available for community-based organizations to run service programs for younger youth. Most states prohibit children under 16 from paid employment or enrollment in job training programs. Working families may be hard-pressed to pay for adult supervision for young teenagers during the summer or after school. As a result, most young people making the difficult transition from middle school to high school have no organized activities during periods when they are out of school, and many are left unsupervised and at risk of engaging in potentially harmful activities.

An approach to this problem should look at these young people as community assets and engage them in service-learning activities during this out of school time. Young teenagers are old enough to make a significant contribution to their communities, if properly trained, organized, and supervised. And if the activities are structured well, with reflection and connections to the school curriculum, they could have a life-changing effect on the young people themselves.

Build partnerships to expand the range of offerings through youth programs.

Youth programs in partnership with AmeriCorps, volunteer organizations, higher education institutions, and other youth-serving organizations can expand the opportunities and services available for the young people who participate. Areas for exploration include:

- Increasing the strategic use of volunteers to expand youth programs.
- Involving full-time or part-time national service volunteers in fundraising, volunteer recruitment and management, and other capacity building activities.
- Evaluating and replicating the successful practices of youth programs that involve national service participants.
- Using national service participants to free up professional staff to perform services only professionals can deliver.
- Extending the reach of youth programs by forming stronger family and community connections.
- Build better pathways from national service to careers in youth-serving professions.

AmeriCorps, higher education service programs, youth corps, and other service programs engaging youth or young adults offer excellent sources of potential youth workers. Creating strategies to tap this pool could increase the quality and supply of professional staff dedicated to America's youth. Needed systems include career paths encouraging national service participants to become youth professionals and the creation of new “professional corps” through which hard-to-fill positions are designated for AmeriCorps members who are paid regular salaries and receive education awards as added incentives.

Expand the number of advocates for positive youth policy by reaching out to national service alumni who served in a youth-related field.

Over 300,000 Americans have served in AmeriCorps, with the majority having served in a child-related organization. These individuals could become a potent force for advocacy on behalf of America's youth, if they could be identified and energized. Strategies include strengthening the civic training provided through national service programs; creating stronger partnerships between policy and advocacy organizations and national service programs and alumni groups; and expanding leadership training opportunities for promising national service participants interested in remaining in youth-related fields.

Conclusion

National and community service presents a powerful but underutilized resource to expand and improve programs for youth that will increase their chances of success and ability to avoid risk behaviors. At the same time, involving youth in service also pays benefits; when young people understand that they can improve the lives of others, they feel able to control their own lives in a positive way. Stronger collaboration between the service and youth development communities offers many potential benefits for both fields, and for youth.

Special thanks to the Youth Development Policy Working Group, including Peter Edelman, Irv Katz, and Joan Lombardi.

National and Community Service: Service as a Strategy to Promote Rural Development

by Deb Jospin and Lee Carpenter

Executive Summary

Poor Americans living in remote rural areas suffer from the dual effects of poverty and inadequate community infrastructures. Rural communities often lack quality, affordable housing. In many locations, industrial development has seriously degraded, if not destroyed, much of the natural environment. Health care, child care, education, and other key services for families are often scarce, if even available, requiring travel to towns or cities that are hours away. Inadequate or nonexistent services are compounded by many rural families' lack of transportation — the majority do not own cars, and 40 percent of rural areas are not serviced by public transportation. One in four poor rural families lives in a house without a phone.

There are no simple explanations for the persistence of poverty in an affluent nation like the United States. In seeking solutions to this continuing situation, experts often cite the following factors:

- The human capital in many rural communities is underdeveloped.
- Businesses with good jobs do not locate in communities that have weak human capital.
- The dominant economic development strategy — capturing the “Big Plant” — is ineffective.
- Rural communities have a long history of environmental exploitation in the name of economic development.
- Individual assistance programs do not build community assets or wealth.

- Many of the poorest rural areas have few or no community institutions that provide their young people with youth development opportunities to foster positive growth and development.
- Many rural communities experience high levels of class, race, economic, and social division.

National and community service programs — from full-time AmeriCorps members to part-time youth or senior volunteers — have played a significant role in responding to these challenges in communities that have made use of them. First, service-based community rebuilding has been a critical component in the survival of rural communities when the private sector market has failed, and traditional jobs have moved away or never existed in the first place. Service programs have helped secure employment and professional opportunities, while at the same time supported economic development solutions that minimized adverse impacts on the environment. Service has engaged young people, including middle and high school students, in reinventing their communities' economies. Service has provided additional opportunities for positive youth development, helping to counter the “brain drain” phenomenon that plagues rural areas. Finally, service has helped rebuild a corps of civically minded citizens, and in the process, created new and expanded leadership opportunities and a high degree of social capital.

Policymakers and programs in both the rural and service fields can do much to develop strong partnerships between the two communities. Much of that work will focus on redesigning and targeting service programs for greater impact in rural areas, and replicating some of the service work that has already proven to be so effective.

Background

Tucked away in the mountains of Appalachia, on “the other side of the tracks” in the Mississippi Delta, in a *colonia* along the Mexican border, or in the small communities that dot the vast landscape of the Native American reservations, rural poverty remains out of sight and out of mind for most Americans. Many of us would be surprised to learn that of the approximately 65 million people who now live in rural America, 7.5 million live in poverty, with many more living “near poverty.” For many, the term “rural” is synonymous with “agriculture,” but only 6.3 percent of rural Americans live on farms, and only 10 percent of the rural poor are farmers. The rural poor are more likely to be married, working in service-related jobs, and less dependent on welfare than the urban poor. They are also more likely to be chronically or long-term poor than poor populations in urban areas. Child poverty is higher in rural areas than in urban areas — over half of rural children who live in female-headed households live in poverty.¹

Poor Americans living in remote rural areas suffer from the dual effects of poverty and inadequate community infrastructures. Rural communities often lack quality, affordable housing. In many locations, industrial development has seriously degraded, if not destroyed, much of the natural environment. Health care, child care, education, and other key services for families are often scarce if they are available at all, requiring travel to towns or cities that are hours away. The impact of inadequate or nonexistent services are compounded by many rural families’ lack of transportation — the majority do not own cars, while 40 percent of rural areas are not serviced by public transportation. One in four poor rural families live in a house without a phone.²

There are no simple explanations for the persistence of poverty in an affluent nation like the United States. In seeking solutions to this continuing situation, experts often cite the following factors:

- **The human capital in many rural communities is underdeveloped.** Rural communities suffer from

a shortage of politically skilled, well-connected, and empowered leaders who can attract and generate resources, and build partnerships to put the resources to good use. These communities cannot afford or attract skilled professionals to teach their children and keep their families healthy. They lack entrepreneurs who create jobs and goods and services in response to the demands of the marketplace. And they cannot count on a skilled and educated workforce that might enable local businesses to expand or attract new employers to the area.

- **Businesses with good jobs do not locate in communities that have weak human capital.** Rural communities are trapped in a modern Catch-22. Businesses that can offer their employees decent salaries and good benefits are unlikely to locate in communities that have an unskilled workforce and a weak professional service base. Without the wealth created by these businesses, however, rural communities continue to have a weak tax base and few philanthropic resources, and are not be able to offer the many educational, health, and social services needed to build their human capital.
- **The dominant economic development strategy — capturing the “Big Plant” — is ineffective.** In many parts of rural America, large-scale industrial development is seen as an economic panacea. For many distressed areas, however, this is a potentially harmful development strategy that ignores the root causes of unemployment, which may include persistent racial discrimination in hiring and job placement, inequities in public education, environment-related health problems, lack of transportation, and limited investment in other public systems. It also overlooks development approaches that build on local talents and resources.
- **Rural communities have a long history of environmental exploitation in the name of economic development.** Many watershed areas have been damaged by acid mine drainage from abandoned deep mines and waste left by mining operations. The focus on capturing the “Big Plant” often disregards the fact that industrial development may be totally incompatible with an area’s environmental base. Rural areas are often their state’s “sacrifice areas” for corporate livestock operations, landfills, and hazardous waste incinerators.

¹ “Towards a Community-Based Rural Policy: Implications for Rural Health Care,” Charles W. Fluharty, Executive Director, Rural Policy Research Institute, March 27, 2003.

² “America’s Forgotten Children: Child Poverty in Rural America,” published by Save The Children, June 2002.

- **Individual assistance programs do not build community assets or wealth.** While government assistance programs do help rural families, they are not designed to build human capital or community infrastructure. Direct help to millions of families through tax credits and public assistance programs is critically important, but by directing assistance to individuals rather than institutions, these funds have not created the systems that will build the skills of low-income rural residents to allow them to become self-sufficient.
- **Many of the poorest rural areas have few or no community institutions that provide their young people with youth development opportunities to influence their positive growth and development.** Young people feel disconnected from their communities, and those who manage to succeed despite the odds leave, creating a “brain drain” that deprives the area of future leaders, entrepreneurs and professionals. Those who stay, often face a future without opportunity.
- **“Social capital” is critical for the long-term health of a community.** Rural communities where “mutual interest” is high and inclusive, integrated networks and institutions promote work effectively across class and race lines, are more successful in reducing poverty than communities experiencing high levels of class and racial division.

In sum, quality jobs will not come to, or stay in, a place where the social, economic, and environmental conditions are not conducive to long-term job retention. Without thoughtful strategies designed to build and strengthen these conditions, rural communities will be unable to break the cycle of poverty that dooms future generations to lives of poverty and desperation.

The Roles for National Service in Meeting These Challenges

National and community service programs — from full-time AmeriCorps members to part-time youth or senior volunteers — are often referred to as the “spark plugs” that make things happen in rural America, the “yeast agents of transformational change.” Service programs, by design, tend to reject the “one size fits all” rural development strategy. Because they are locally

driven, they respect the cultural and environmental complexities that exist in a place. They are inclined to look creatively and holistically at challenges, bringing with them a range of resources to meet a range of needs. The people serving in these programs may be individuals recruited from outside the community who have specific expertise, or local people who are recruited and offered skills training by the program. They leverage additional resources and partners, engaging the community in their efforts. They also create a sense of hope and empowerment, a “can do” enthusiasm that counters the old sense of despair.

Tyrrell County, North Carolina’s investment in its Youth Corps program provides a case study of the impact service can have on a distressed rural community. North Carolina, like so many other rural states, faces a complex set of challenges: economic (persistent poverty, declines in agriculture, loss of manufacturing jobs); social (racial discrimination, lack of social infrastructure, lack of shared power); and environmental (degraded lands, loss of forest cover, declining water quantity and quality). Tyrrell County is the least populated and poorest county in North Carolina. The poverty rate is 25 percent, almost twice the state average. More than 42 percent of the county’s people of color live in poverty, compared to 15 percent of its white residents. On the other hand, Tyrrell County is ecologically wealthy — its wetlands and swamp forests provide critical habitat for a range of endangered birds and other species. Its Albermarle-Pamlico estuary, almost one-third of North Carolina’s land base, is one of the largest and most ecologically significant in the country.

Tyrrell County community leaders recognized that they had neither the infrastructure nor the large-scale workforce nor the developable land base needed to recruit large industries. A 1990 strategic planning process identified tourism as a potential economic “engine,” given the county seat’s location on Highway 64, the main route to the Outer Banks. At the time, although close to two million vehicles annually passed through Tyrrell County, almost no one ever stopped.

The Tyrrell County Community Development Corporation (CDC) was established in 1992 to build grassroots leadership and to engage both traditional and non-traditional leaders in creating new economies that are tied to protecting, enhancing, and restoring the fragile wetland environment that dominates the county.

In contrast to many of the other CDCs in North Carolina that are focused on affordable housing development or commercial development, the Tyrrell County CDC's founders felt that human development was the first critical step in addressing the issues that had plagued the county for generations. They believed that as human capacity was built, jobs and housing development opportunities would follow. They decided to focus on two primary programs: a small business incubator to enable job creation that did not rely on local government, and a youth conservation corps to enable leadership and entrepreneurial development for young adults in the region. While community members realized that some young people would always leave the area, they wanted to be sure that they at least had the option to stay, live, and work in the county.

The Regional Enterprise Incubator Network was established to encourage small business development as an alternative and supplement to county employment opportunities. The incubator supports African American- and Latino-owned small businesses while providing the administrative and business planning and management services that can make the difference in whether a business survives during the critical first three years. Many of the new businesses are being linked to the county's strategy of eco-tourism development: catering, bed-and-breakfasts, sign-making, guide services, accounting services, and insurance providers. The CDC is working to help local craftspeople establish a cooperative that will enable collective production and marketing of their crafts. Finally, it is partnering with statewide nonprofits and public agencies to strengthen the entrepreneurial training components of the Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) program. CDC leaders believe that the county's future economic vitality lies in their young people's "entrepreneurial spirit" and the self-sufficiency that is enabled through locally owned small business development.

The Tyrrell County YCC provides job skills and educational training for young adults. Over the past nine years, it has helped over 120 young adults learn natural resource management skills, job skills, and life skills while completing community service projects and leadership training. Modeled on the Civilian Conservation Corps programs of the 1930s, the youth corps members spend 35 hours a week in jobs skills training; five additional hours of the week are devoted

to educational, life skills, leadership, and career development training. Corps members who lack high school diplomas work to complete their GED requirements; those who have graduated from high school work on college entrance-level studies. The program promotes leadership development through rotating crew leader assignments, involvement in decision-making, and community outreach efforts.

The results of this program speak volumes about the investments made. In an area in which only 17 percent of its youth have traditionally gone on to college, 33 percent of the young people who have gone through the program have gone on to higher education, and the other 66 percent have found full-time employment in the area. The YCC program has also effectively met two critical needs for eco-tourism development. The first is the development of the programs and the physical infrastructure to enable the parks and refuges to provide an accessible, enjoyable outdoor experience for an increasing number of visitors, while minimizing their impact on the environment. The second is the building of human capital in the community so that all residents of the region experience the benefits of this carefully planned development through better education, more economic and employment opportunity, and improved quality of life.

One of the keys to the success of the Tyrrell County YCC has been the range of cross-sector partnerships that were developed to support it. The program has been developed, administered, operated, and evaluated by community members and volunteers. Faith leaders, elected officials, educators, farmers, agency staff, foundation leaders, retirees, parents, grandparents and siblings — people of all ages, races and backgrounds — have been core partners. As a result of this process, according to one of the partners, "entrenched biases in the community have been reduced . . . there have been distinct changes in some individuals' openness to working in positive ways with people of color."

These strategies and programs are helping to build the civic capacity and engagement in the overall development plans, while also ensuring that secure employment and professional careers are directly tied to careful and sustainable enjoyment of the area's natural heritage. The cars are now stopping to see the sights, and the young people have a reason to stay home.

What do you do when traditional jobs have moved away, or were never there in the first place? Service-based community rebuilding is critical for the survival of rural communities in which the private sector market has failed.

A key goal of rural development is helping people who are committed to “place,” stay and thrive in that place when the private sector market does not function. Rural CDCs, like the one in Tyrrell County, provide examples of community development agencies that do just that by looking holistically at their challenges and using service as a strategy to redevelop their communities.

Another interesting model is the Quitman County Development Organization (QCDO), located in the Mississippi Delta. In the decades from 1950 to 1990, more than half of its mostly African American residents left Quitman County. Only a little more than 10,000 people live there today, and nearly 32 percent of them live in poverty. For the past 25 years, however, QCDO has provided the residents of Quitman, Panola, and Tallahatchie Counties with the resources they need to help themselves:

- QCDO develops, manages, and rehabilitates affordable housing; offers pre- and post-purchase counseling and follow up services for first-time home buyers; and provides low-interest loans and grants for housing rehabilitation. It recently completed a duplex community providing homes to 24 families. It owns and manages 14 single-family homes, and has rehabilitated more than 140 homes within its three-county service area.
- In 1998, QCDO began its Micro-Enterprise Development and Business Loan Program to stimulate and support business development by women and minorities within its service area. The program provides micro loans, gap financing and training, and technical assistance to support trucking, restaurant, day care, and other local businesses.
- QCDO has operated its Child Day Care Center on the campus of a local high school since 1994. The Center serves up to 49 children between 6 weeks and 4 years old. It also provides jobs to 12 low-income mothers.
- In 1981, QCDO established a credit union to meet

the needs of low-income families and individuals unable to obtain conventional credit. Today, the credit union has 3,500 members, has made over \$12 million available in loans, and has assets of \$5 million. It also operates the Youth Credit Union Program to help young people develop organizational and business skills. The Credit Union also owns a youth-run store that offers Internet services after school. This program has 525 members.

- QCDO provides a host of social services to the community, including financial counseling, a food pantry and homeless shelter, after-school tutoring and homework help, a health monitoring service for isolated elderly people; and notary services.

The AmeriCorps*VISTA program has provided consistent, long-term support to QCDO. The agency hosts two or three AmeriCorps*VISTA members each year, all of whom are from the community. They provide the organization with much needed staff support and specialized training. According to Robert Jackson, the head of the agency, AmeriCorps*VISTA and other AmeriCorps service programs, such as Save the Children and the Delta Service Corps, have made it possible for people from the community to support the good work of the agency through service. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for QCDO to find the resources to add regular employees to its staff to perform the functions now performed by AmeriCorps*VISTA members. In addition, many of the members have stayed with QCDO as full-time employees or have gone on to other employment opportunities after their service years have ended. One former AmeriCorps*VISTA member is now the Branch Manager at the Credit Union, another developed the Individual Development Account (IDA) program at the Credit Union, and a third runs another CDC, also in the Delta. They are all committed to the Delta, they have stayed in the Delta, and they are helping make the Delta a better place to live.

Serious problems exist in rural communities where jobs are scarce. One place where the market has functioned poorly is in Indian Territory. The Navajo Nation, for example, covers a geographic area of 25,000 square miles and has approximately 300,000 residents living in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Almost 60 percent of Navajo families live below the poverty level. A critical

subset of the Navajo poor are Navajo Veterans — those who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces, from World War I through Desert Storm. The challenges facing Navajo Veterans and their families are complex — they have difficulty acquiring services because of the language and cultural barriers they face when interacting with outside agencies. Families have difficulty obtaining basic services for their children because of the extreme living conditions (sparse telephone service, lack of running water and electricity, isolation, and inadequate housing). A new AmeriCorps program, Strengthening Alliance of Veterans and Families (SAVF), hopes to meet and reduce these challenges.

SAVF focuses on ensuring that Navajo Veterans and their families are accessing and being provided quality health care and other social support services. All of the AmeriCorps members in the program are from the Navajo Nation, and are either Veterans, spouses of Veterans, or dependents of Veterans. In addition to the health care and social service outreach that they do, the AmeriCorps members provide home maintenance support that allows older Veterans to remain in their homes more safely and comfortably. The members work with the children of Veterans, ensuring that they are ready for and succeed in school. The AmeriCorps members do not do this all by themselves, but rather recruit other Veterans and community volunteers to help sustain this support network. The SAVF AmeriCorps members have also created partnerships with other service programs (Save the Children, the Foster Grandparent Program, and various service-learning programs) to leverage additional resources for greater impact. Finally, the AmeriCorps members themselves receive specialized professional training “to improve their service to our Navajo Veterans and their families.” Many of the younger Navajo members have now taken jobs in the building trades, jobs that did not exist prior to this service program. The SAVF is working to create a sense of community and a sense of hope for the Navajo Nation.

It doesn't work to talk about “good education” as a rural development strategy. Young people need to be engaged in redeveloping and reinventing the economies of their communities.

Rural schools can help revitalize their communities when school studies and activities relate to the needs, resources, and places where they are located. Such is the

case in Lubec, Maine, a town where fishing has always been a way of life. With the collapse of Atlantic commercial fisheries in recent decades, the economy built on catching and processing fish has dwindled. Per capita income is about \$9,000 per year, and the unemployment rate for September 2000 stood at 10.4 percent. However, farming fish and other forms of ocean life is becoming a viable opportunity for those with scientific and technological know-how. Students at Lubec High School are taking advantage of this opportunity, and are working to turn things around in Lubec with an innovative aquaculture program that teaches science and business skills while creating new economic hope for the town.

Students and teachers in Lubec, with considerable help from community volunteers, have built a state of the art aquaculture center for raising several species of fish in a laboratory setting. Students have also devised tanks for raising algae for shellfish experiments, and have helped design and build a 400-foot greenhouse connected by pipes to the fish tanks. This enables nutrient-rich wastewater to be used to grow vegetables hydroponically. Lubec's students are developing entrepreneurial skills by contracting with the local grocery store to sell their lettuce, cabbage, squash, hot peppers, and flowers.

Students involved in the aquaculture activities are noticeably more motivated in school as they discover how their schoolwork addresses local problems. In addition, collaborations between the students and working members of the community have stimulated the students' interest in critical civic issues. They know that their work is making a difference — jobs are being created, resources are coming into the community, and their futures (and their families' futures) are looking brighter. They are assets, not liabilities, to their community, helping to build a new economy, a new life for their community, while at the same time remaining respectful of their past.

Rural communities must fight “brain drain.” They must demonstrate through their investments and actions that youth are important to their long-term well-being.

“Community development can't happen without youth development,” according to Francisco Guajardo, a teacher and founder of the Llano Grande Center, which serves the border towns of Edcouch and Elsa,

Texas — the second poorest area in the state. Ninety percent of the homes in Edcouch/Elsa have an income under \$10,000 and 9 out of 10 parents don't have a high school diploma. For years, the community has been isolated geographically and socially. Its history dates back to the early 1920s when real estate and development companies came into the area and created what is still known as the "Magic Valley." Its agriculture-based economy, which was profitable for a few families, was built on the backs of Mexican laborers and neglected the educational development of these workers and their children. The community has been searching for economic, educational, and political reinvestment.

The Llano Grande Center is the product of a group of local youth who grew up in this South Texas community in the early 1980s, left to attend college, and are beginning to "come home." In creating the Center, they were responding to a perceived vacuum in progressive leadership and a youth culture whose talents were latent. Formalized in 1997 with support from the Annenberg Rural Challenge, the Center today focuses on youth development, youth engagement, and youth leadership as the cornerstones of its community building initiatives. Signifying its most celebrated impact, are the 51 local students the Center has helped to attend Ivy League colleges over an eight-year period. Dozens more have gained admission into other very competitive universities across the country. Even more extraordinary are the many students who have returned to the community after graduating.

In addition to its pre-college advising programs which include student visits to elite colleges, the Center: sponsors an institute to build young people's media skills; organizes a seminar series through which students, teachers, and community members discuss issues such as education, economy, and sustainable development; and publishes a dual language journal dedicated to sharing the stories of community members. It has supported student production of a documentary film about their community, offered space and student support to the local chamber of commerce, and designed an innovative Spanish immersion institute for students from outside the community to hone their language skills by spending three weeks with a local family — and bringing much-needed dollars into the local economy.

Big Ugly Creek, West Virginia is another isolated, persistently poor community that has invested heavily in its children. The residents of Big Ugly Creek live an hour's bus drive from local schools, one to two hours from the nearest major city, a half hour from any store, gas station, library or public building, in a county without a movie theatre, public swimming pool, or public recreation center. Less than half of the adults in the county have high school diplomas, 43 percent of the children live in poverty, and unemployment hasn't dropped below double digits in years.

When the local elementary school was forced to close in 1993, the community was devastated. Parents, however, organized to get control of the school building. After a two-year fight, they won the battle to lease and then purchase the old school building for one dollar, and the Big Ugly Community Center was established.

Children who come to the Center participate in structured activities sponsored by the nonprofit, Step by Step, including West Virginia Dreamers, an innovative after-school and summer program that awards students with a \$50 scholarship for exploring their dreams. Each year, the young people declare one dream that they want to pursue and program coordinators work with each child to help turn this dream into reality. Whether their goal is to make the world's biggest pancake, take fiddle lessons, go white water rafting or act in a play, children stretch themselves and their families.

The program design is based upon a few core principles. First, children stay in the program until they graduate from high school. This continuity ensures that skills and behaviors are reinforced over time. Second, a core group of adults make a long-term commitment to work with the children. Some of these adults have gone on to join AmeriCorps and are taking leadership roles designing new programs and activities. Third, the value of hope and the ability to go after dreams is central to all parts of the program.

The synergy created by the community's investment in its children has infused a full continuum of community education programs, including playgrounds, GED classes, a teen jobs program, and family reunions that attracts as many as 200. Step by Step's nonprofit status has served as a vehicle for the community to win national competitions for arts, service-learning, and after-school grants. In addition, through its partnership

with Save the Children, AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps*VISTA members have provided over 25,000 hours of service to Dreamers' communities, tutoring children, making home visits, supporting after-school programs, and creating computer labs to help bridge the digital divide.

Rural communities need to support an entrepreneurial spirit, to create and strengthen internally grown small business enterprises.

Rural Action, located in the Appalachia region of Ohio, envisions a region of clean streams, healthy forests, thriving family farms, meaningful jobs for everyone, effective, well-funded schools, and lively towns that remember local history and celebrate their stories. This vision is becoming a reality largely because of a long-term investment in Rural Action's *Strategy for Rural Renewal* by the Corporation for National and Community Service. In 1994, the Corporation placed 18 AmeriCorps*VISTA members with Rural Action to help implement its Strategy for Rural Renewal. At that time, Rural Action had two staff members, a small attic office, one computer, a very modest budget of \$16,000, and 13 citizen-based committees working on some aspect of sustainable development. Today, Rural Action has 30 paid staff (13 of whom are former AmeriCorps*VISTA members) working out of six offices, with a budget of \$1.6 million.

At the core of Rural Action's programs are its AmeriCorps*VISTA members, many of whom are selected from the communities in which they were raised. Working in communities, they develop citizen-based "action teams" that are tasked with "visioning" a new reality for their communities. Once the visioning process has taken place, additional AmeriCorps*VISTA members who have some specialized training in subjects such as hydro-geology, cultural geography, journalism, photography, fund-raising and membership development, and forestry, work with the community members to help make their visions real. By sharing their skills with community members, the AmeriCorps*VISTA members allow the communities to bypass the expensive route of highly paid consultants who come in to "fix their communities." By putting the skills in the hands of local people, the stewardship of the region is then owned by the people of the region.

With the help of its AmeriCorps*VISTA members, Rural Action has developed an approach to economic development that centers on four principles: keep local dollars local, use resources sustainably, build on unique local assets, and expand local ownership and options. Given the lack of an industrial base in this part of Ohio, small business and microbusiness development and expansion provide the most likely opportunity for economic development. Since 1995, Rural Action has been working with agricultural and forest-based enterprises, a sector that is often overlooked by business development programs. One of its most promising projects is *Good Food Direct!*, a guide to ordering fresh foods in season from local producers. Its Sustainable Forestry program has advanced the local capacity for herb and mushroom cultivation through workshops on cultivation, site visits to identify the best places to grow herbs and mushrooms, and research on different growing techniques. Another Rural Action program, Roots of Appalachia Growers Association (RAGA), is a support network for growers of ginseng and other woodland medicinals. The many RAGA members gather monthly to discuss any number of topics, including agricultural tax issues, recent legislation that may impact their business, and value-added products.

Rural communities must commit to rebuilding a corps of civically minded citizens, and, in the process, create expanded leadership opportunities and a high degree of social capital.

For years, Western Maryland has suffered from high rates of unemployment, poverty, teenage pregnancy, child abuse, neglect, binge drinking among young people, and academically low-scoring students. As a collaboration of over 20 service sites and other community organizations, **A STAR!** In Western Maryland (**A STAR!**) is helping to address those challenges.

For eight years, **A STAR!** has been a catalyst for change in Western Maryland. It has recruited and graduated 244 AmeriCorps members, almost all of whom are from the local area. These members have: served in the public schools to increase the one-on-one attention given to students; provided after-school and other support services to adjudicated, abused, abandoned, and other at-risk youth; helped to ensure that people needing access to food, clothing, shelter and independent living assistance receive the necessary

services; and promoted safe, healthy, and sustainable forms of land use, including alternative agriculture and outdoor recreation programs. Finally, the AmeriCorps members, working out of their home site at Frostburg State University, have recruited and trained hundreds of additional local volunteers for their programs.

A STAR! is committed to working with the community and building the capacity of its partners to meet the needs of the community. For example, through its eight years as **A STAR!** service site, the Western Maryland Food Bank has expanded its food distribution network from approximately 65 participating agencies to 130 organizations that distribute nearly 2 million pounds of food each year to local families. It has relocated its warehouse to a newer, more modern facility, and is now generating enough revenue and to sustain a full staff without needing federal assistance. Another service site, Turning Point of Washington County, was able to launch its Transitional Age Youth Program with the help of an **A STAR!** AmeriCorps member. This program serves young people, ages 17 to 21, who are in need of vocational and other life skills, and who have been diagnosed with mental illness. After just one year as an **A STAR!** service site, the program is able to operate without the assistance of AmeriCorps funding.

One of the main goals of **A STAR!** is to develop its AmeriCorps members into effective leaders who will continue to be engaged in their communities beyond their year of service. During their time in the program, they receive specialized training to help them perform their service activities as efficiently and effectively as possible. They also attend workshops that cover a variety of topics, including conflict resolution, cultural awareness, facilitation skills, service-learning, and volunteer management. Additional training includes a citizenship curriculum that helps members build an ethic of civic responsibility and community leadership. In their communities, **A STAR!** AmeriCorps members continue supporting the efforts of organizations to meet their volunteer needs by encouraging others to volunteer, assisting with volunteer training, and advocating for people in the communities who rely on their service. The program is designed to provide members with a network of peers who can assist organizations and communities in accessing much needed resources.

Rural communities must protect and restore the environment.

The community's relationship to nature is one of the key determinants of what is rural. Rural communities are not artificial constructs that can be laid upon the landscape. They require a symbiotic relationship with "place"; otherwise, they are not rural. When rural development destroys or seriously degrades the natural environment, it destroys the core basis for "ruralness."

Southwestern Pennsylvania, for example, is a place of great beauty, often missed because of the region's overshadowing problems. Acid mine drainage (AMD) is the most devastating and widespread environmental problem, as well as a significant economic and social constraint. AMD&ART, a nonprofit organization located in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, is trying to address this problem through a holistic, collaborative, and interdisciplinary approach that integrates AMD remediation with economic development and community renewal.

AMD&ART's pilot project in Vintondale, Pennsylvania, was conceived as a large-scale artful and educational public place that would draw attention to the problem of AMD, while at the same time bringing new life to abandoned mine lands. A professional team consisting of a scientist, a historian, a landscape designer, and a sculptor worked with AmeriCorps members, AmeriCorps*VISTA members, and community members to design and build the site on 35 acres of reclaimed mine land. This approach has provided an arena large enough to support the interests and concerns of the community. It has turned aerators into fountains, limestone ditches into waterways, settlement cells into ponds and wetlands, and industrial sites into historical "ghosts" that invite reflection.

Alan Comp, the founder of AMD&ART, describes AmeriCorps as a model for "low cost and highly effective project support for deep community engagement, and for fresh insights and perspective as each new generation of AmeriCorps finds its feet and brings its special skills to AMD&ART." This year AMD&ART is hosting a 28-member AmeriCorps*VISTA team, with each member working with individual watershed groups across five state lines. The members working with this program also bring specialized training. For example, one of this year's AmeriCorps*VISTA

members is a biologist, specializing in plant diversity. Another has a degree in fine arts/painting, and will put his skills to work as the project's Education Coordinator. A third member has a degree in history, and will provide on-site historical information about the town and project to all who visit the site.

The full economic impact of AMD&ART's projects is difficult to determine, but some of the more tangible results of the remediation projects, such as restored fish habitats, bring measurable gains. In the Appalachian region, the average recreational fisherman spends between \$20 and \$31 each day. More opportunities for hiking, bicycling, boating, and other recreational sports will bring additional benefits. In addition, the AMD&ART sites will contribute to the area's tourism economy, thereby generating demands for new service-oriented businesses. Clean water, recreational opportunities, and imaginatively designed public places will make communities more attractive to businesses and employees. Local residents will enjoy the immediate benefits of clean water and reclaimed land, as well as the secondary economic benefits that will follow community improvements.

Recommendations

Policymakers and programs in both the rural and service fields can do much to develop strong partnerships between the two communities. For example,

- Service programs, particularly those of the Corporation for National and Community Service, can be targeted to ensure that more rural youth have the opportunity to engage in service activities that further their academic learning, help them attend college, develop their job skills, and connect them to their communities.
- More specifically, state and federal policy makers can increase funding and support for rural youth corps programs that provide young people with job skills, education, life skills, leadership, and career development training.
- Policy makers can provide exemptions to the current limitations in the AmeriCorps program — specifically, those relating to costs-per-member caps and program size — which limit the scope and impact of the program in rural areas.

- Full-time service opportunities that include a living allowance and benefits must continue to be available to enable more members of the community to participate in community-building work.
- Service learning programs that successfully connect school studies and activities to the needs and resources of their rural communities can be replicated in other rural communities. Best practices can be collected and shared with rural schools that are ready to implement programming.
- More rural CDCs can partner with AmeriCorps*VISTA for capacity-building and staff support, enabling them to offer more critical services to more people in their communities.
- AmeriCorps*VISTA's successes in microenterprise development, community asset building, and youth entrepreneurship programs can be replicated in rural communities across the country.
- The “professional corps” model can be expanded to supply a skilled workforce to rural areas. These hard-to-fill positions would be designated for AmeriCorps members who are paid regular salaries and receive education awards as added incentives.

Conclusion

National and community service can be an effective strategy for rebuilding human capital and community wealth assets in distressed rural areas. Among other things, service helps create “youth-supportive” communities, viewing young people as resources and providing them with the skills and training they need for positive growth and development. Service supports an entrepreneurial spirit through small business development and support for unique local assets. Service often brings together members of a community in pursuit of a common goal or vision — creating partnerships with and bridges among people of different races, ages, and backgrounds who may have never worked together before. In sum, service-based community rebuilding allows people who are committed to “place” stay and thrive in that place, even if the private sector market has failed.

Special thanks to the Rural Policy Working Group, including Mil Duncan, Rachel Tompkins, Amy Glasmeier, Sandra Rosenblith, David Dodson, Bo Beaulieu, and Karl Stauber.

National and Community Service: A Resource for Long Term Care

by Tom Endres

Executive Summary

Most in-home care for vulnerable older persons is provided by members of the family. There is evidence that the system of informal care is under tremendous stress. One in four U.S. families care for aging relatives. A comprehensive look at caregiving in 1996 found that 22.4 million families are providing physical and emotional assistance to older relatives or friends, which is a three-fold increase from a decade ago. Working men and women are struggling to care for their own parents at the same time they care for their children and, sometimes, spouses. Approximately 41 percent of caregivers are also caring for children under the age of 18. Sixty-four percent of caregivers are full- or part-time workers who report that their jobs often suffer because of responsibilities to older relatives. Businesses also suffer. It is estimated that American companies lose \$17 billion annually because employees are absent caring for sick parents. Children who must help pay for nursing home care for frail parents can be financially devastated.

National and community service programs can support, expand, and enhance long-term care and independent living services and save money in the process. National service initiatives: help people live at home longer; support community based programs such as telephone reassurance, nutrition, and adult day care programs; expand and enhance the work of human service agencies; and offer relief to over-burdened caregivers. Trained service participants, placed in well structured roles are a source of dependable, reliable, high quality help to family caregivers and long term care service agencies.

By providing the elderly with companionship, transportation, light chores, and other basic services, national and community service members can save the government, the private sector, and the family, money. By simply performing services like taking someone to a doctor or helping shop for groceries, they can reduce

or put off the need for elderly people to enter a nursing facility. By helping ensure that a frail older person takes the appropriate medication and gets adequate nutrition, they can avoid the need for hospitalization or expensive acute care visits. They can also improve the quality of care at a time when there is a shortage of home care workers.

National service can provide an enormous emotional boost to overwrought family caregivers by providing respite services. For these reasons, major corporations have shown strong interest in forming partnerships around a national service senior care initiative. Already, AT&T has subsidized the Senior Companion program in Phoenix, Arizona and other partnerships are in development.

The resources needed to stem the long-term care crisis are staggering. Since much of the infrastructure is in place, national service stands as a ready vehicle to mobilize and deploy human resources within the long-term care system. National service is a promising, low cost strategy to realize four crucial outcomes:

- Provision of no or low cost assistance to families in need of independent living supports for family members;
- Provision of respite care services to family caregivers;
- Mobilization of a new, talent-filled, human resource pool for service agencies;
- And assistance in the development of inter-generational service initiatives.

Introduction

America faces a looming long-term care crisis as the population ages and people live longer lives. In 2001, the need for long term care increased among the under

65 population due to increased incidents of health problems such as asthma and mental disorders. During this same period 7 million men and women over the age of 65 needed long-term care services, by 2020 this number will increase to 12 million.

At least 70 percent of those in need of long-term care services live at home with family members and friends as the sole caregivers. However, a confluence of factors indicate that reliance on this informal care system is unwise and risky. Many believe this system of “family and friends” is already at risk and is about to be overrun by the demographic revolution.

As we awaken to the approaching crisis in long-term care in an aging America, we also are awakening to a second era of civic engagement. There is movement toward renewed commitment to community and family. Values of personal responsibility, neighbor helping neighbor, civic responsibility, embracing diversity, and commitment to something bigger than oneself are being rekindled and will play a role in defining America at the beginning of the 21st century.

National service can play an important role in addressing the coming long-term care crisis by offering caregivers a ready source of new people power to assist with personal care chores and to provide respite. In doing so, national service can unleash the resource potential of the young, the old, and everyone in between as volunteers.

This paper will outline the key factors of the long-term care crisis, provide an overview of national and community service in relation to long-term care, list potential barriers, and offer recommendations for how national service programs can be improved to address the growing crisis.

Meeting Long-Term Care Needs Through Community Service: Building on the Past

Since the middle of the last century we have experienced two periods of social innovation in which volunteer service played a prominent role. The first was during the 1960s when service became a strategy to address high poverty rates and to prepare for the growth in the over 65 population — from 17 million

to 34 million by the late 1980s. The second was during the 1990s, when service was again called upon to add new resources to help community-based organizations to meet serious social needs and to provide relief to the high cost of education.

The inventions of the 1960s established national and community service as a credible vehicle to mobilize human resources to alleviate social problems. In addition to the Peace Corps (1961), which was created to improve third world conditions and build international understanding, and Volunteers In Service to America (VISTA) (1964), which was created to work on reducing poverty at home, older Americans were a particular focus:

- The Foster Grandparent Program (FGP) (1964) was created to supplement the income of low-income seniors in exchange for providing 20 hours of personal service to children with special and exceptional needs and their families.
- The Older American Act (1965) created the Administration on Aging (AOA) and a national network for planning, coordination, and provision of aging services through State Units and local Area Agencies on Aging. Volunteers played important roles in developing the network and in the planning, coordination, and provision of services.
- Amendments proposed to the reauthorization (1968) of the Older American Act introduced the idea of service roles in retirement for older persons and the idea of older persons serving older persons. AOA became a proving ground for the planning of new service initiatives.
- The Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) (1971) provided volunteers from any social-economic background to serve regularly in community social service agencies to increase the quality and reach of their services.
- The Senior Companion Program (SCP) (1972) places low-income people 55 and older to provide in-home support to peers at risk of losing their independence to live at home. With SCP, the link between long-term care and service was formally established.

These programs remain as relevant today as they were when they began. Evaluation Reports and Program

Accomplishment Reports have justified continuing federal expenditures for these programs over three decades through nine national administrations. However, despite their longevity and demonstrated success, they have never been adequately funded to unleash their full potential.

The social innovations of the 1990s were designed to build on past success:

- Service Learning and demonstration initiatives for youth corps, nonprofits, and educational institutions were launched when President George H. W. Bush signed the National and Community Service Act of 1990.
- Three years later President Bill Clinton signed the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 creating the AmeriCorps program and expanding opportunities for Americans of all ages to serve their communities and integrating federal volunteer programs (VISTA and Senior Corps) into the Corporation for National Service.
- Soon after his election in 2000, President George W. Bush called on all Americans to devote the equivalent of at least two years of their lives or 4,000 hours to voluntary service. The President pointed to National and Community Service programs as one way to answer the call, and created the USA Freedom Corps to coordinate citizen volunteer efforts both domestically and abroad.

These efforts differed from earlier service programs in several important ways. The AmeriCorps program design set the standard. Participants were assigned to service opportunities to get things done—to have an impact on serious social problems. There were no income requirements, age limitations or mandated program focus. Participants could serve part-time or full-time, for which they received a living allowance and assistance to defray educational expenses.

With an awakened community spirit, a national call to service, a more flexible, outcome-based array of programs, an established reputation of success, and with demonstrable results impacting serious social problems, national service is poised to become a human resource development system capable of providing large numbers of experienced, trained resources to work on pressing national and community problems.

A looming problem which national and community service could help resolve is the crisis in long-term care. Despite small efforts, limited in scope, and constrained by regulation, national service initiatives have had much success in helping people retain independence at home.

The Long Term Care Crisis and National Service

What is Long-Term Care?

Long-term care services is a general term used to describe an array of medical or supportive services that help people perform basic life activities. Within this very broad framework of long-term care, there is a set of services referred to as *personal care*. This term is used to describe hands-on assistance with basic Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) such as eating, bathing, dressing, toileting, and moving. Some programs include assistance with Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs) such as shopping, preparing food, managing money, using the telephone, and performing housework. These personal care services are also frequently referred to as Independent Living Services. Medical care typically is not considered personal care. The availability of non-medical *personal care* allows many people to live independently at home or in the least restrictive environment possible.

The Nature and Scope of the Looming LTC Crisis

Many people will need long-term care support at some point in their lives. Young and old alike, we all fear loss of independence and institutionalized care, and will go to great lengths to avoid thinking about it or preparing for it. Yet, the risk is substantial:

- **Everyone is at risk and the risk increases with age.** The loss of ability to perform ADLs or IADLs due to an accident, catastrophic illness, or worsening of an existing condition could tip the balance from independence and control to dependence and loss of control of one's living standard at any time. The risk increases with age, but 46 percent of the independent living population is under age 65. Over 12 million people of all ages need long-term care services. Four-hundred thousand children, ages 5 to 17; 5.1 million, ages 18 to 64; and 5.1 million, ages 65 plus,

live in a community setting. About 2.6 million are nursing home residents. A majority, 10.6 million or 87 percent of the long-term care population, resides in the community.

- **Few are aware of or prepared for the risk.** It is striking to realize that nearly one in four U.S. households were involved in caring for an older family member or friend in 1997. Another study indicates that 22 percent of people, ages 45 to 55, are caring for or financially supporting older relatives. Without assistance from family members, many people faced with cognitive impairment, physical hardship, or chronic health problems would be forced to enter institutions for their care. While the need for health insurance to cover a patient's medical expenses and catastrophic illness is widely accepted, independent living insurance is relatively new and few people are covered. And it is prohibitively expensive for most families.
 - **We are dependent upon an unpaid, informal system.** Families are clearly the mainstay of independent living support services. Estimates of the number of family caregivers vary between 45 million (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2002) and 52 million (National Survey of Families and Households, 1987/1992). Families, mostly women, provide uncompensated care to 63 percent of adults needing support services. In 1997, the value of uncompensated care was estimated at \$196 billion compared to \$83 billion for nursing home care and \$32 billion for home health care. Unless the impact of care giving responsibilities on families is better understood, many people may find themselves without the support they are counting on and may be unnecessarily forced into public institutions prematurely. They may find themselves or their family with serious illness or impoverishment.
 - **Informal caregivers do not know who to turn to for help.** The problem is not necessarily in the number of programs or services. Rather, the difficulty lies in fragmentation of funding and service delivery, confusion about access and eligibility, uneven or adequate supply, coordination of services, important gaps in services, and issues of affordability. The simple matter is that few families know where to turn or what options are available when there is a long-term care need for family members. Unfortunately, care
- needs, service programs, and people change, requiring that families navigate a confusing, fragmented system to find new or additional services.
 - **The informal care system may not meet future needs.** The overwhelming preference for home care combined with population growth and the increasing demand for disability services by all ages, will require increased numbers of paid professionals to provide care or give respite to informal caregivers. Moreover, changes in family structure typified by the elderly having fewer adult children who live farther away, make continuing reliance on this informal system not only unwise, but bad policy. Without family and friends to rely on, many would be forced to assume the cost of paid care. At the same time, the number of people choosing "personal care" employment, due to its unpleasantness and hazards, is not increasing as quickly as the demand for their services. As a result, paid help may not be available when it is needed.
 - **Care giving is a difficult, relentless, demanding job.** The task of caring for a person with a disability, the frail elderly, or someone who is chronically ill is an emotionally and physically demanding task that can not be fully appreciated until undertaken. Care giving requires patience and is frustrating because care givers and care receivers frequently differ in their perceptions about the amount and type of assistance needed or provided. Thinking of family care giving as a job may seem inappropriate. After all, this is what families are supposed to do and, in most cases, want to do. But as America ages and families struggle to meet obligations; blind acceptance of what families are supposed to do for one another may be the central problem. And other aspects of life do not let up. This is particularly true for those sandwiched between the needs of children and parents.
 - **Caregiving exacts a price at work.** The productivity of employed caregivers is affected particularly because of altered work schedules. Two in 10 working caregivers turned down chances to work on special projects; almost as many avoided work-related travel. According to a recent survey, 40 percent of survey respondents said that care giving affected their ability to advance in their jobs. Others passed up job promotions, training, assignments opportunity for a job transfer or relocation, and many were unable to acquire new job skills. These factors

influence the long-term earning capability of family members. Due to routine absences of so many caregivers, it is estimated that the loss of productivity is \$17 billion a year.

- **Care giving risks the economic security of families.** Increasing costs of health care and long-term care services (\$58,000 per year) and the increasing use of long term-care mean that many families will be unable to afford or gain access to needed services. Further, the financial security policies built in the 1930s (Social Security) and the health and social policies built in the '60s meant to provide financial and retirement security (Medicare/Medicaid/Older Americans Act) may not be there or may cover a lower level of service than is necessary. For example, even assuming increased use of Long-Term Care Insurance, Medicaid spending would increase from \$43 billion to \$75 billion in 2020.

Although federal and state governments are making modest efforts to strengthen the informal care system and to provide relief to full time caregivers, the efforts are young, lagging behind the realities of need and cost, and vary from state to state. A patchwork of programs with differing eligibility requirements, points of access, and mix of funding (casino funds, lottery money, and tobacco settlement funds, Medicaid Waivers) will not be able to keep pace with demand.

Service as a Strategy: Ready Resource to Speed Efforts and Fill Gaps

The need and cost for long-term care will soon compel policy makers to seek alternative, cost effective options to provide support to people with chronic health problems, cognitive difficulties, or disabilities. One alternative that should head the list is national service.

Long-term care and national service are synergistic in the way that they join those in need with those who want to help through mutually benefiting and satisfying ways. There also appears to be a favorable cost to benefit value. Research is needed to establish the cost benefit ratio between the cost of service and the costs of other alternatives.

National service is already an effective resource for long-term care and could become a major people

power resource. National service is helping people live at home longer, enabling home and community-based care providers to offer more personal services to more people, freeing professional staff from non-professional tasks, and offering respite to over-burdened caregivers. And as the needs for long-term care increase, reaching crisis proportions by 2020, an updated, reformed, and integrated national service approach could quickly provide needed assistance, fill gaps in services, and expand state and community-based agency services. Based on its success to date and its potential for the future, national service could be: 1) a cost effective resource for families needing long term care support for family members, and 2) a “people power” resource to long-term care service providers.

1. National service as a cost effective resource for families and service providers.

Studies (Research Triangle and VNAA) have shown that service programs engaging seniors to help seniors are often more reliable than for-profit home care. Studies also show that when seniors give consistent and intensive support to special needs children, those children are able to achieve a higher quality of life and success. Frail older persons trust their peers more than paid home care aides and senior volunteers have a much lower turnover rate. Children and youth respond to the loving presence of a senior who is available to provide the extra attention that staffs are unable to provide. Volunteers are assigned to work with either special needs children or adults through care plans prepared by a local agency. As a relationship is formed, volunteers show up not because they have to, but because they really care—it shows in the sensitivity of the care delivered. They also show up because they want to give back in ways that provide meaning, give purpose, and that are personally satisfying. For all these reasons, national service, especially senior service, is devoting a significant portion of their resources to address long term care support needs and a host of new initiatives are emerging. How and in what ways are these efforts helping?

- In a Texas community, John, age 79, recently underwent amputation of his left leg above the knee due to vascular problems. His wife Sara, age 72, has lung cancer. They are devoted to each other, do not want to be separated, and each needs the strength of the other just to make it through each day. The hospital

social worker requested assistance from Interfaith CarePartners, a recently formed non-profit organization that works with partner congregations to assist in their development of service programs that manifest each congregation's commitment to member care and serves as an outreach program in the wider community. Interfaith CarePartners develop Care Teams of 12 volunteers to help people like John and Sara. Care Team members assigned to John and Sara are making it possible for them to remain in their home. Team members provide light home chores, drive Sara to and from the clinic for daily radiation therapy, drive John to his physician's office, pick up pharmacy items, serve as a sounding board to each as they confront their separate realities, and provide them with companionship. One advantage of the Care Team model is the ability to pick up and maintain a schedule that is possible only because it is shared by enough volunteers that not one individual is over-burdened.

- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation recently invested a \$100 million dollars in a similar effort called Faith in Action. It has made grants to nearly 1,200 local groups nationwide, each group representing people of many faiths who volunteer to work together to care for their neighbors who have long-term illnesses or disabilities. They help pick up groceries or run errands, provide a ride to the doctor, do friendly visiting (talking and listening), read or help pay bills.
- A significant portion of the over 500,000 Retired and Senior Volunteers working throughout the country in over 72,000 community service organizations provided a variety of long-term care support. According to evaluation and impact data compiled through the WESTAT Descriptive Survey RSVP Volunteers:
 - Participated in activities such as peer counseling, writing letters, listening, reading, and talking to 366,618 individuals to ease feelings of isolation and loneliness;
 - Provided friendly visiting, telephone reassurance, and bereavement outreach to 744,610 individuals;
 - Provided supportive health and social services to 35,004 individuals needing long term care in the home;

- Provided information, program enrollment or referrals on in-home care to 20,182 people;
- Provided services such as housekeeping, meal preparation, nutritional information referral and service coordination to 14,382 individuals needing long term care in the home;
- Spent 295,000 hours providing respite care services to family caregivers.

Although most long-term care support is needed by people late in life, increasing numbers of the population under 65 years old, including children and youth, need long-term care support. National service can also be instrumental in meeting the long term care needs of the under 65 population

- **Family Friends** is an innovative intergenerational program of the National Council on Aging. The overall goal is to facilitate the development of long-term and empowering relationships between older adult volunteers and families who have children with special needs. Volunteers visit the same family every week, and offer the kind of attention and caring that is unique to grandparents and Family Friends. As a result, parents are provided respite from care and special needs children receive the care and extra attention needed. Program surveys show that a unique feature about Family Friends is the longevity of the matches and the depth of the relations that form.
- Similarly, a majority of 30,000 **Foster Grandparents** tended to the needs of 275,000 children and teenagers with special and exceptional needs. According to impact data, during 2001 Foster Grandparents provided:
 - Supportive services, rehabilitation, therapy, and exercise to 12,000 children with physical disabilities;
 - Provided supportive services to 43,000 learning-disabled elementary students (K-6); and
 - Provided non-residential and clinic support services to 12,000 children with mental health problems, including emotionally impaired and autistic children.

A recent program evaluation by WESTAT shows that Foster Grandparents contribute to positive developmental outcomes for children in the areas of:

1) emotional well-being; 2) self-esteem; 3) social and behavioral skills development 4) language development; and 5) cognitive development.

2. National service as a new “people power” resource to long term care providers.

Central to strengthening and expanding the capacity of community-based organizations are intensive (full or part-time) and sustained (9 - 12 months) service roles. This was a primary reason for creation of AmeriCorps. A follow-up study to A Five Year Evaluation Report completed by Aguirre International on AmeriCorps (Aguirre International) shows the value of intensive, sustained roles. A representative sampling of projects found that the institutional impacts of AmeriCorps were far stronger than expected. The study documented that AmeriCorps:

- Enabled their service partners to expand, improve, restore, streamline, or add services.
- Formed collaborations between agencies that often resulted in the formation of a network of community organizations that pooled resources, shared organizational insights, and provided communities with more cohesive and comprehensive services.
- Served as a catalyst for change-enabling sponsors to expand and improve their existing organization and, along with private and public partners, create new solutions to community problems.
- Brought new resources into communities by raising funds and recruiting volunteers.
- Reached out to local businesses in their communities with, on average, two to three businesses becoming involved with each program.

There are numerous examples related to long-term care services. In the Independent Living Program of Western Washington State, an AmeriCorps team coordinates the majority of the agency’s programs. They develop partnerships with schools, senior centers and non-profit organizations, recruit volunteers, and oversee programs. The AmeriCorps team enables the agency to leverage staff and resources to touch the lives of more than 1,000 children and 400 elders per year who are in need of long term care support. Last year, 2,017 children and 536 elders were served.

The Corporation for National Service has tested new program elements and approaches to senior service. Among many successes, the most significant was the development of the Experience Corps model in partnership with Civic Ventures, Inc. and John Hopkins School of Medicine. The Experience Corps model — built on research and accumulated knowledge from other service programs — defines key program elements important to the needs of agencies and the characteristics of today’s volunteers.

- The **team concept**, which brought together six to 10 volunteers meeting regularly at one site, so that by working together they could support each other and influence the direction of the project;
- An **outcome focus** to produce a demonstrable result;
- **Critical mass** of older adult volunteers to highlight the impact a group could have within a specific organization and, ultimately, in a particular neighborhood;
- **Intensive service**, with an expectation that older adults make a commitment to work at least 15 hours a week throughout the school year;
- **Incentives** in the form of a stipend (which ranged from \$100 to \$200 a month, depending on the project’s location) for volunteers who served at least 15 hours per week;
- A **variety of meaningful service roles** that ranged from direct service roles to individuals or small groups and indirect service roles to assist with project coordination to capacity building roles involving project leadership and project development;
- **Diversity of participants**, including volunteers at all income levels and a special focus on drawing more men to the program;
- **Training, learning and growth opportunities**, striving to strike a balance between what volunteers gave and what they got from their experience and develop skills needed to effectively fill their roles.

The new approach to developing service programs using the above elements has proven highly successful. An evaluation by Aguirre International of the Experience Corps model applied to elementary schools (Seniors for Schools) indicates extraordinary success.

For example, 85 percent of teachers reported observing positive changes in student literacy and 74 percent of teachers reported observing positive changes in reading or assessment test results. Ninety-four percent of the principals, staff, and teachers surveyed wanted to continue having the volunteers present in their institutions the next year. When applied to the issues of independent living on a small scale pilot basis, the model showed similar promise. An evaluation by Research Triangle Institute found that the Experience Corps for Independent Living pilot was particularly successful in meeting its goal of expanding the supply of independent living services to frail elders and their families in the communities being served. The Experience Corps model, applied to the issue of long term care on a significant scale, holds great promise.

In addition to building agency capacity, national service can also expand the agency's services through filling direct service roles. For example, according to a study conducted by the Visiting Nurses Association of America, the assistance of volunteers helping with non-medical, routine but essential tasks frees up professional caregivers to work on more difficult problems, resulting in a higher quality of care. Several national service initiatives offer direct service to those in need.

The largest national service initiative providing direct services is the **Senior Companion Program**. In 2001, over 15,500 Senior Companions volunteers work through local non-profit organizations to provide home and community-based services in their community. These Senior Companions aided more than 61,000 of their peers with routine and instrumental activities of daily living so they could remain independent, and provided respite support to family caregivers. A recent Quality of Care Evaluation completed by Research Triangle Institute indicates the organizations served by the program reported a very high degree of satisfaction with the Senior Companions' services, including: their ability to provide a respite for caregivers; their ability to provide companionship; the amount of time they spent with the clients; their ability to prepare meals; their courtesy and reliability; and their ability to help clients with personal care needs. Most organizational representatives reported that the Senior Companions were as responsible (79 percent) and skilled (72 percent) as their paid staff members; in some cases, they were viewed as more responsible and skilled. The evaluation also shows

that Senior Companions also had very beneficial effects on the agencies, the clients, their families, and the Senior Companions themselves.

- The volunteer supervisors reported that the Senior Companions allowed them to serve additional clients, and provided additional services to their present clients. In particular, the Companions enabled them to serve two new groups of clients: those with special needs, and those not eligible for subsidized services and could not afford to pay for the services they needed. Several respondents said that they assigned Senior Companions to clients with a higher level of functioning so that agency staff could focus on the clients with the greatest service needs.
- The Senior Companions served their clients on a no-fee basis. Thus, the agencies and their clients realized considerable savings in not having to pay market rates for services.
- The organizations placed a very high value on the Senior Companions and their service, with 89 percent of representatives of organizations describing them as very valuable.
- The organizations reported that Senior Companions constituted a vital communication and monitoring link between the clients and the volunteer station. They served as client advocates, notified staff of changes in clients' behavior, and functioned as the "eyes and ears" of the agency. Agencies reported that they used the Senior Companions to communicate directly with clients' family members.

AmeriCorps members also made independent living easier for disabled, elderly, or hospitalized individuals by providing direct support and help to strengthen the capacity of community-based organizations and agencies to meet the needs of their older clients. According to a multi-year, multi-tiered evaluation on the impact of AmeriCorps, Aguirre International found that AmeriCorps strengthened infrastructures, brought new financial resources, and increased the service capacity of existing institutions. When serving through organizations providing services to persons with disabilities, AmeriCorps members serve as brokers to seniors and other persons with disabilities to increase their independence and engage them in a variety of community service activities.

Intergenerational Programs

Youth service initiatives can play important roles.

Learn and Serve America and other intergenerational programs, combine service to the community with student learning in a way that enhances student learning and addresses a community need. Through their service, students also make a difference in the lives of others, a portion of whom are those needing long-term care support.

Young people can make a significant contribution to those needing long term care services by: providing chore services to improve home environments or safety; helping to write letters, read, or tell stories; or building an intergenerational connection through which they learn and through which the isolation of people living at home or in nursing facilities is decreased. As a result, residents feel uplifted, have more visitors, feel listened to, are intellectually stimulated, feel satisfaction that they are giving to young people, and form personal connections. For example, in Massachusetts at Taunton Junior High School, students learn about good nutrition and then teach it to elders in the community. At the same time they also build relationships, interview, and document their history.

Recommendations for the future

To become instrumental in helping to meet long term care needs, national service needs a long term care strategic plan and business case. Both are needed to convince policy makers of the potential that national service holds in helping to address the increasing need for long-term care services. Existing national service programs provide the foundation for building a long-term care initiative. With only minor changes, the existing programs could become even more effective. A national service system that is easily accessed by service agencies and potential volunteers and that is easy to administer will position service to become a resource of choice for community-based long term care provider agencies.

Policymakers and programs in both the long-term care and service fields can do much to strengthen opportunities to find solutions to potential barriers. Together they can:

- Overcome resistance to service as a strategy by making the “business” case for service as a viable, cost effective option using research as a base.
- Overcome recruitment obstacles because of the difficult task of caregiving and because it raises the fears of volunteer and national service participants of what may be in their future.
- Avoid potential staff and volunteer role overlap and conflicts.
- Fill the need for service standards and systems for verifying volunteer qualifications,
- Address policy issues regarding employment versus paid volunteering and potential management-labor relations issues.
- Reduce staff fears of job displacement.

Together, policymakers and programs in both the long-term care and service fields could define and embrace common goals. Examples of mutual goals might be:

- Define the added years that come with the longevity and demographic revolutions as a new life stage and establish service and civic engagement as essential elements.
- Find new ways to tap the resource potential of future generations of retirees through modifications to existing service programs and supporting new approaches such as Experience Corps.
- Promote collaboration and partnership among the public, private, and independent sectors.
- Promote the development of a caregiver advocacy system to give them a voice in setting policy, allocating resources, and the collective power needed to promote alternative solutions and change.
- Create a social marketing and public information campaign to promote service and to make it a “top of the mind” resource to care providers.
- Develop a clearinghouse for the collection of information about the service and long term care and for dissemination of best practices emerging from the field.

Conclusion

America faces a looming long-term care crisis as the population ages, people live longer lives, and the need for long-term care increases among the under 65 population. Families who are the backbone of the long-term care system today, can not be counted on to provide the same level of care in the future. As the boomers begin to require long-term care services in 2020, the informal care system will most likely be overwhelmed. If we are unsuccessful in averting a long-term care crisis, its costs may bankrupt programs upon which people are relying or the services they are expecting will not be there. As this issue develops policy makers will be forced to find cost efficient alternatives.

As we awaken to the approaching crisis in long term care in an aging America, we also are awakening to a movement toward recommitment to community that will play a role in defining America at the beginning of the 21st century. The spark of civic renewal has rekindled interest in national service and fostered new developments in the service field. Decades of success along with the recent new developments have resulted in service being accepted as an effective strategy to resolve serious social problems. National service is now a system of programs that has the capacity to mobilize and deploy significant numbers of trained, qualified people to impact long-term care needs and be a resource boom to community social service agencies.

References:

- Health, Health Care, and Disability, Health United State: 2002; Current Population Reports, "Americans with Disabilities, 1997"
- "Long term Care in the United States: An Overview.", Feder, J., H Komisar, and M. Niefeld (2000) Health Affairs, 19(3): 40-56.
- Forgotten heroes: Family caregivers, Carol Levine, Director of the Families and Health Care Project at the United Hospital Fund
- Key Findings from a National Survey: Long-Term Care from the Caregiver's Perspective, June 2002, Kaiser Family Foundation
- National Alliance for Caregiving and AARP (1997). Family Caregiving in the U.S.: Findings from a National Survey.
- Home and Community-Based Long-Term Care, AARP Research Group
- Independent Living: Do Older Parents and Adult Children See It the Same Way? Linda L. Barrett, PHD, AARP Research Group November 1998.
- The Nursing Home Workforce: Certified Nurse Assistants, Steven R. Gregory, July 2001, AARP
- In Brief: Personal Care Services: A Four State Comparison, AARP Public Policy Institute Issue Paper #2001-04 (March 2001)
- Helping the Helper: State Supported Service for Family Caregivers, AARP Public Policy Institute
- AARP, In the Middle: A Report on Multicultural Boomers Coping with Family and Aging Issues, July 2001; Aron et al.
- "Family Caregiving in an Aging Society.", Tennstedt, S. (1999) Presented at the U.S. Administration on Aging Symposium, Baltimore, MD, March 29.
- Special Committee on Aging Internet Site, Thirteen hearings addressing long-term care.
- The Role and Value of Senior Companions in Their Communities, Research Triangle Institute, March 2001
- RSVP Descriptive Survey, WESTAT
- AmeriCorps*State/National Direct Five Year Evaluation Report: A Follow-Up, Aguirre International, September 1999.
- Effective Practices of Foster Grandparents in Head Start Centers: Benefits for Children, Classrooms, and Centers. Final Report, Westat Incorporated, Dec. 1997.
- 2001 Senior Corps Impact Reports for RSVP, FGP, and SCP.
- The Second Year of the Experience Corps for Independent Living Demonstration Evaluation, Donna J. Rabiner, PH.D., Research Triangle Institute