

WHO GIVES: WHO GETS

A DIALOGUE ON
COMMUNITY AND
NATIONAL SERVICE

A Summary of a
Regional Dialogue
Seattle, Washington
January 20, 1998

I. Overview

Service is an American tradition, a vital part of our country's heritage. Since the founding of our country, Americans have responded to calls to action, donating time, energy and resources to help neighbors and communities in need. This commitment to community has made America stronger, building links among Americans and creating pride in our nation.

In recent years, as we have searched for new ways to address some of the most serious challenges facing our country, Americans have once again turned to volunteerism and citizen service. Government, philanthropy, business and nonprofits are increasingly looking to the energy and effort of volunteers and to community and national service as ways to solve problems, from hunger to homelessness, from literacy to the environment. This renewed emphasis on service is galvanizing the interest and engagement of all sectors. It is also raising questions and sparking debates about the role of each sector. What is the appropriate role of the federal government in supporting opportunities for people to serve? What is the role of the private sector? How best can the public, private and nonprofit sectors work together to support citizen engagement in service?

As we approach the new millennium, now is a good moment in our history to take stock of where we are with respect to citizen service, what gains we have made and what lessons we have learned. This paper is a summary of a January 1998 discussion on the value and future of national service in America. That discussion, convened by the Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service and The Henry M. Jackson Foundation, aimed to

illuminate critical issues and questions that confront how and whether the nation continues to support and promote community and national service: questions from the value of mandating service for youth in America to the cost effectiveness of service as a community problem solving strategy. We hope that the discussion presented on the following pages sparks continued interest in and commitment to community and national service in America.

II. Background

General Overview

America's tradition of giving has evolved over the years. Although service has always been an integral part of our country—it is, in fact, older than the Republic itself—the concept of large-scale national service programs did not evolve until 1910, when William James published his article, *The Moral Equivalent of War*. Over the next seventy years, the government and others launched a string of major national initiatives that called on Americans to give of themselves.

In the 1930s, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt launched the Civilian Conservation Corps and other Depression-busting efforts. In the 1960s, President John F. Kennedy created the Peace Corps. In the 1980s, a broad range of national organizations came into being—from the Campus Outreach Opportunity League to Youth Service America to the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps—reflecting a resurgence in the youth service movement. The 1980s and early '90s also saw the introduction of new and substantial sources of philanthropic support for service programs. Foundations such as the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Dewitt Wallace

Readers Digest Fund, the Ford Foundation and others made major investments in service learning as well as other community and national service efforts.

In addition to the active engagement of philanthropy in the field of service, the federal government assumed a new position of leadership as well. Working with Congress, President George Bush led the call for the National and Community Service Act of 1990, which created a new federal partner to help develop the burgeoning service field. Although funding was a modest \$75 million, the Act focused federal attention and dollars on four major areas: K–12 schools, higher education, youth corps and national service models. At the same time, President Bush launched the Points of Light Foundation to promote his message that “the definition of a successful life must include serving others,” and created the first Office of National Service in the White House.

When President Bill Clinton took office in 1992, he brought with him a commitment to grow America’s involvement with service. From campaign trail speeches on the need for all Americans to “serve the nation,” he moved quickly into presidential actions. Working with Congress, President Clinton was able to put into place the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, building on the 1990 legislation and establishing both the Corporation for National Service and AmeriCorps, the nation’s largest non-military, stipended national service program since FDR’s Civilian Conservation Corps.

The Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service

Before the federal government’s most recent involvement in volunteerism and community and national service, many groups and organizations throughout the country supported service efforts. Philanthropy was an important part of the mix, joining with schools, nonprofits, the private sector and individuals to fund programs that recruited and placed volunteers in communities in need. The recent federal funding and focus on service has helped to expand philanthropy’s impact and involvement even further. The influx of federal dollars has leveraged more money from private entities and enabled nonprofit groups to focus on important but previously under-funded areas, including research, evaluation and infrastructure development.

This increased level of activity has encouraged grantmakers to share ideas and lessons. In 1993, following the adoption of the National and Community Service Trust Act, a group of grantmakers, representing both corporate and foundation giving programs, began to meet informally to discuss their financial support of and experience with community and national service. Calling themselves the Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service, these foundation executives came together to share their own experience and to better understand the federal government’s role in shaping the field of community and national service. In 1996, the Grantmaker Forum organized three Task Forces—Research, Funder Outreach, and Policy—and adopted the following mission: *To promote community and national service within the philanthropic community, encourage cross-sector partnerships*

in support of service, and address issues that have thwarted the expansion of the service field.

Since that time, the Grantmaker Forum has undertaken a number of efforts to promote and showcase philanthropy's involvement in community and national service. Those efforts include: participating in national briefings with policy leaders, sponsoring dialogues on community and national service, hosting conferences to share different perspectives on service, and developing and disseminating a discussion guide and video on community and national service. The Grantmaker Forum is committed to sharing philanthropy's non-partisan perspective with program and policy leaders locally and nationally to advance and help shape the future of community and national service in America.

Regional Convenings

The Grantmaker Forum has long understood the importance of local and regional involvement in the accomplishment of its goals. Service, after all, is inherently local.

Recognizing this, in 1997, the Grantmaker Forum committed to collaborate with local foundations and associations of grantmakers to host regional dialogues on community and national service. Each gathering is designed to be unique, with the selection of participants and focus shaped by local needs and interests. But the overarching goal of these dialogues is the same: to launch and support a local discussion on service, and to spark further thinking on the importance of cross-sector partnering and the role of philanthropy, the nonprofit sector, the public sector and the private sector in supporting service opportunities for all.

On January 20, 1998, the Grantmaker Forum in partnership with The Henry M. Jackson Foundation, sponsored its first regional dialogue in Seattle, Washington. The Henry M. Jackson Foundation was a natural and eager sponsor. Since its establishment in 1983, the foundation has targeted several areas, including public service, where Senator Jackson played a key leadership role during his forty-three year tenure in the United States Congress. The Washington Commission on National and Community Service, the Pacific Northwest Grantmakers Forum and the Volunteer Center of United Way King County also served as co-sponsors of the dialogue.

The two hour Seattle meeting, attended by more than one hundred representatives from philanthropy, the corporate sector, school districts, service programs and government, brought together a dynamic panel of regional and national leaders to engage in a debate about the critical issues facing service today. The discussion, moderated by Seattle Deputy Mayor Maud Smith Daudon, featured: the Honorable Harris Wofford, Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National Service; Father William J. Sullivan, S.J., Chancellor, Seattle University; Peter Blomquist, Director, Starbucks Foundation; and Washington State Lieutenant Governor Brad Owen.

To provoke thinking on some of the critical issues facing service today, the discussion was structured around seven key questions:

- 1) Why is interest in volunteerism/service prominent on the national agenda right now?
- 2) Is citizen service "getting things done"?

- 3) Does service contribute to youth development?
- 4) Is mandatory service a good idea?
- 5) Should private/philanthropic dollars pay for a program like AmeriCorps?
- 6) Can stipended service contribute to racial harmony through dialogue and shared experience?
- 7) What more can be done by each sector to support and strengthen service?

For each question, panelists were given several minutes to provide their perspectives and recommendations. At the conclusion of the discussion, audience members were invited to share their insights and ask questions of the panelists.

Based on the success of the pioneering Seattle session, the Grantmaker Forum is committed to continuing to sponsor regional dialogues around the nation.

III. Service and the Pacific Northwest Experience

The setting for the Grantmaker Forum’s first regional dialogue —the Pacific Northwest, and in particular, Washington State—provided a rich context, both historical and current, to shape the panel’s discussions.

The Pacific Northwest region has a long involvement in and commitment to service. Former Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson was a longtime pioneer and leading voice for citizen service. During his tenure in Congress, Senator Jackson spearheaded numerous efforts to strengthen national service, including the

creation in the late 1960s of the Youth Conservation Corps, the spiritual descendant of FDR’s highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps. As a prominent political figure in the Pacific Northwest, Senator Jackson’s focus on service helped to focus the region’s attention on the issue.

Today, the Pacific Northwest is a national leader in using service to address literacy and education issues. Evidence of this abounds as all sectors look to service as a strategy for improving learning outcomes among high-risk youth in low economic communities. Starbucks has launched its Book Drives campaign and has established a new foundation dedicated to literacy. Washington’s Promise, the state’s response to the 1997 Presidents’ Summit, is focused on expanding community commitments to assist students in securing a sound education. By the Year 2000, Washington’s Promise aims to attract 40,000 Washingtonians of all backgrounds to serve as mentors, role models, neighbors and volunteers for students and other individuals in need throughout the state. This regional interest in education was reflected again and again during the Seattle dialogue, as panelists frequently referenced what service is doing in the field of education.

Additionally, recent federal and state initiatives continue to shape the face of service in the region. For example, Washington State received significant funding for its America Reads initiative. And Washington State Governor Locke has publicly voiced his opinion that every young person should be required to serve his or her community and country.

IV: *Who Gives: Who Gets:* A Discussion Summary

Since 1993, with the adoption of the National and Community Service Trust Act, the federal government has sponsored full-time and part-time paid service activities and coordinated unpaid volunteer activities of youth and seniors. What have these four years of national and community service programming taught us?

On January 20, 1998, in Seattle, Washington, more than one hundred philanthropists, educators, representatives from nonprofits and businesses, and others came together to engage with this question, as the Grantmaker Forum and the Henry M. Jackson Foundation sponsored a dialogue entitled *Who Gives: Who Gets*. The following four prominent individuals—three from Washington State and one national figure—participated on the panel and launched the discussion.¹

- **Brad Owen, Washington State Lieutenant Governor.** Lieutenant Governor Owen served in Washington’s House of Representatives and Senate before being elected to his current position in 1996. In his current position, Lieutenant Governor Owen is dedicated to building and enhancing diverse partnerships within the state’s communities to attain safe, supportive and nurturing environments for youth.
- **Peter Blomquist, Director, Starbucks Foundation.** Mr. Blomquist has long been dedicated to service as a strategy, first working with CARE, the international relief and development organization, and most recently as director of the newly created Starbucks Foundation.

- **Father William Sullivan, Chancellor, Seattle University.** Father Sullivan was instrumental in the founding of Campus Compact, the national association of colleges and universities committed to the integration of service into the educational experience.
- **Harris Wofford, CEO, Corporation for National Service.** Since helping to launch the Peace Corps in 1961, Mr. Wofford has been in the forefront of the nation’s service movement. As a United States Senator, he helped draft and pass the 1993 National and Community Service Trust Act. President Clinton appointed him CEO of the Corporation for National Service in 1995.

Seattle Deputy Mayor Maud Smith Daudon served as the panel’s moderator, directing specific questions to the panelists and fielding questions from the audience at the end of the session. Not all panelists were asked to respond to all questions. What follows is a brief, question by question summary of the panel discussion, along with a short section for each question—titled *Commentary*—that attempts to capture the key implications from the perspective of philanthropy.

¹ More detailed biographies for both the panelists and moderator are included in the appendix.

Question #1:

Why is interest in volunteerism/service prominent on the national agenda right now?

Discussion

Moderator Maud Smith Daudon opened with the question: “What is it about where we are as a nation that has inspired so much interest recently in volunteerism and service?” Harris Wofford kicked off the discussion, stating his belief that the “quiet crisis of youth”—not a sudden commitment to volunteerism—is driving the recent attention and focus on service. Looking at the recent renaissance of service, from funding for AmeriCorps to the bandwagon support for America’s Promise, Senator Wofford sees the American public filled with hope and reaching for a new tool to tackle illiteracy and other problems that are corroding confidence in the country’s future. “We can, in new ways, in a more complicated time, crack the atom of civic power, and take a problem like the crisis of children and youth and...get things done to solve (it),” Senator Wofford said. “I think that, in fact, is the essence of the new drive for national service.”

Father Sullivan agreed with Senator Wofford’s perspective, then quickly added additional context. “People are getting involved,” he said, “because the media has done a remarkably effective job in turning its spotlight on some of the most pressing problems facing the country today.” Americans are choosing service as the preferred strategy for turning the problems around for two main reasons: they are skeptical that centralized government can respond

effectively; and they are responding to our roots as Americans, that we care and have compassion for others. “It continues to be fed by the value building institutions of our society, and I would say, in particular, by the churches,” he said. “They continue to teach the lesson of the equality of everyone, the right of everyone to equal (and fair) treatment.”

Commentary

The 1997 Presidents’ Summit is one example of how the nation’s leaders are helping to raise the profile and role of volunteerism and citizen service as our right and responsibility. These efforts are tapping into a deep conviction across this country that we must find new and effective ways to wrestle with our most pressing problems. The comments, particularly those by Father Sullivan, underscore the importance of fostering a broad partnership to address the country’s ills. In a time when Americans doubt the government’s ability to solve these problems, it is more important than ever to have a national service strategy in place that builds on the strengths of all sectors.

“The most important threat to America’s future is not military or economic but moral, and it comes not from beyond the seas but from within our cities, our families, and even our hearts, in the decline of the civic institutions that once transmitted our values. In part because of the blessings of peace, young Americans are in danger of growing up without knowing what it means to serve their country or their community.”

Former Senator Sam Nunn

Question #2:

Is citizen service “getting things done”?

Discussion

Deputy Mayor Daudon moved into the second discussion question, pointing out that the motto associated with our national service program, AmeriCorps, has been “*Getting Things Done*”. She asked: “Is this accurate? What is service accomplishing locally and nationally—not only AmeriCorps but all forms of service?”

While all of the respondents noted the wide range of service-driven accomplishments—from training and encouraging students to enlist in food and clothing drives, to the Corporation for National Service’s success in engaging more than a million Americans in service—each speaker sought to deliver a broader message.

Lieutenant Governor Owen challenged the gathering to advocate more Americans to see service to community and country as a personal responsibility. “I believe we can do more to generate that feeling of a need to contribute,” he said. Father Sullivan cautioned the audience to make sure that credit is shared among the many organizations engaged in service. “It’s very important that we remember that what is being done is being achieved by an absolute plethora of organizations and associations,” he said. “In other words, it would be a mistake for us to think that this has come about because we have a Corporation for National Service.” And Senator Wofford reminded the gathering that the Corporation for National Service’s successes, while important and noteworthy, are dwarfed by a greater challenge: the need to reach all young

Americans. “At most, we have to think about national service as a catalytic agent,” Senator Wofford said, encouraging the Corporation and powerful civic organizations across the country to work collaboratively. “It is far bigger than anything we (the Corporation) can control or can take responsibility for.”

Deputy Mayor Daudon asked the panelists to identify effective service and volunteer programs to model or expand. Senator Wofford cited a program called Young Heroes, an initiative that uses CityYear corps members to engage middle school students in service for twelve Saturdays each year. The program has grown from one hundred classes in Boston to one thousand classes in nine cities.

Lieutenant Governor Owen offered examples that highlight the impact of individuals—from a young Washington State student who organized a fundraising drive to help a teacher’s spouse suffering from leukemia, to the Western Washington University students who started a volunteer peer counseling program on issues such as AIDS and domestic violence. Father Sullivan provided the last example, talking about the changes he sees in Seattle University students who work on projects begun by Mother Teresa in Calcutta. “When you talk about the transforming effect of service, those kids come home and they’re not the same people,” he said.

Commentary

Service is making a difference. The results can be seen in the stories shared by Father Sullivan, Lieutenant Governor Owen and the others. But the discussion makes clear that significant challenges remain. There is a need for organizations to share credit and effort; there is

a need to measure both the impact on communities served and on the servers themselves; and finally, only a fraction of the nation's youth are currently engaging in service to community.

Question #3:

Does service contribute to youth development?

Discussion

Leading off from the previous discussion, Deputy Mayor Daudon asked the panelists: "Does performing service contribute to youth development? And if so, how? And does it make a difference whether the young person volunteers to serve, as opposed to either being paid or required to serve?"

All of the respondents strongly endorsed the positive impact service can have on individuals. Peter Blomquist cited the example of former Senator Paul Tsongas (1941-1997), who talked about his Peace Corps experience when asked why he was running for President. Blomquist explained that in response, Senator Tsongas said, "My whole adult life has been to search to find again that same sort of meaning and purpose that I had when I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia in 1962 to 1964." Blomquist went on to say that service broadens your perspective. "When you go outside of the context in which you've been raised and you are obliged to...consider the issues and problems and realities of people that (are) different from yourself, your life will be broadened.

Father Sullivan echoed Blomquist's convictions, but tempered his remarks with a cautionary note: a meaningful service experience grows out of a carefully structured program—one where there is supervision, monitoring and training. "If you're going to run a youth service program...(you need) the preparation and the thinking through of what the experience is, of having adult models present, and then providing the students with some kind of a circle where they can have a conversation about their experience," said Father Sullivan. Sullivan argued that philanthropy could play a key role in supporting this essential infrastructure.

Peter Blomquist, addressing the possible impact of paying volunteers, strongly dismissed any negative ramifications. "I think that's a non-issue," he said, citing as an example the \$300 per month stipend received by VISTA members. "Did that take away from their volunteer service?" he asked. "Not at all. They were volunteering. They were committed to doing something good as young people and their government was giving them a chance." Senator Wofford added another dimension to the debate, noting that stipends are essential if all Americans are to have the opportunity to serve.

"The real question is: Do you have a need for full-time service? If you do, only saints and quite wealthy people can serve for a year full-time without the kind of pay...volunteers get," Wofford asserted. "I think there's a real case for full-time service when it's combined with unpaid volunteers."

Commentary

This part of the discussion raises some important challenges for the field of service. What role can philanthropy play to ensure that service programs incorporate the needed structure as identified and described by Father Sullivan? And, again, how and where does one measure the impact of service? The examples cited during this part of the discussion were personal development for the server, giving the server a sense of purpose and commitment. Yet, in the name of accountability, a great deal of emphasis is placed on the value of the service to the community served.

Another challenge that was raised here relates to political debates. In Washington, D.C., arguments are put forward that stipended service is not real service at all, yet the speakers at this session made compelling arguments that stipends provide all Americans with an opportunity to serve, and establish a means by which people can serve on a full-time basis for a period of time. There is real value in having a system of full-time service that is available universally to all who wish to serve. If the issue of stipends is, in fact, as Peter Blomquist suggests, a false issue, what can the field of service and its supporters do to put such an issue to rest?

“My whole adult life has been to search to find again that same sort of meaning and purpose that I had when I was a Peace Corps Volunteer in Ethiopia in 1962 to 1964.”

Senator Paul Tsongas (1941-1997)

Question #4:

Is mandatory service a good idea?

Discussion

“What about the concept of mandatory service for the nation?” Deputy Mayor Daudon asked. She expanded, “There are countries, from Israel to West Germany and others, where young people are required to contribute to the development and defense of their nation through community or military service. Why not here in the United States? Wouldn’t a policy of mandatory service generate a level of effort that could really solve some of our nation’s most pressing domestic problems?”

Though the rationales differed, most respondents agreed that mandatory service was not a goal worth pursuing at this time. Senator Wofford suggested that mandatory service at the national level is simply not politically feasible right now. Lieutenant Governor Owen agreed, adding that it is better to have people “give from the heart” than be forced to donate time. Only Peter Blomquist suggested not giving up on compulsory service just yet. “I think...we should ask ourselves whether it’s a good idea or not, and if it’s a good idea, then I think we should ask the question: why is it politically impossible? And we should maybe challenge that assumption,” Blomquist stated.

While Senator Wofford did not support mandatory national service, he did encourage local school districts to teach citizenship through required, hands-on volunteer experiences. Similarly, he called on parents, employers and others to make universal

voluntary service a common expectation—in the same way students are expected and pressured, but not required, to graduate from high school. His comments sparked an extended discussion.

Virtually all of the panelists supported Senator Wofford’s call for civic leaders and others to do a better job of promoting service. As Lieutenant Governor Owen said, “I believe...we can arouse in the heart of people the desire to volunteer and contribute.”

There was less consensus, however, around Senator Wofford’s suggestion that schools mandate service. Father Sullivan voiced concerns about such graduation requirements. “My fear is that students will go to that with all the enthusiasm and interest with which they go to physical education,” he said. Lieutenant Governor Owen shared Father Sullivan’s concerns, but on balance, did support the idea of a community service requirement. “By introducing students to service, they might find out that this is something that...they really want to do,” Owen said. Peter Blomquist offered the strongest backing for the idea. “I believe there is a transformative power in being out in the community and doing work,” he said. “And I think we needn’t be apologetic about saying... that’s what young people in this country ought to be doing.”

Deputy Mayor Daudon asked the panelists to explain why the discussion focused so heavily on youth. Father Sullivan offered two explanations: 1) the availability of an enormous pool of volunteer power, and 2) the desire to instill a lifelong commitment to giving among the young. Senator Wofford agreed, though he also noted the growth of another potential pool of volunteers: sixty million seniors, fifty-five years and older.

Commentary

The discussion suggests the need for a concerted and strategic communications campaign to raise the visibility of service—highlighting its value and sharing ideas for incorporating service into schools and communities. Similarly, as more schools mandate a service requirement for graduation, it is important that the service community look closely at such programs, tracking the value both to the served and the students. Are such programs, in fact, triggering a longer-term commitment to service?

Question #5:

Should private/philanthropic dollars pay for a program like AmeriCorps?

Discussion

“Despite the fact that most people seem to believe in the concept of service and the value of national service,” Deputy Mayor Daudon observed, “the debate continues about who should pay for service. Is it appropriate and possible,” she asked, “for the private and philanthropic sectors to collectively underwrite the cost of a large-scale, stipended service program like AmeriCorps?”

There was consensus among the panelists that the private/philanthropic community needs to play an important funding role in the field of service, but that it is neither feasible nor desirable to replace government funding with private sector dollars altogether. Peter Blomquist noted that the private sector has

“I think that the private sector is very, very good at supporting and funding new ideas and new strategies. But I think once we see what is working, then it is in the public’s interest for the public dollars to be spent to sustain that strategy.”

Audience member

neither the self-interest nor resources to take over government’s role. Rather, he called on the private and philanthropic sectors to collaborate with the government to contribute in those areas they do best: modeling programs, evaluating impact, leading new efforts. “Why aren’t we doing a PR campaign about service that becomes just as well known as the Army’s ‘Be all that you can be’ campaign?” he asked. “We could fund a new public relations strategy to make service a higher priority in the lives of the country.”

Lieutenant Governor Owen said it was crucial to keep the private and philanthropic sector partners in the funding mix, particularly at a time when government and the public are increasingly looking to the private sector to pick up the tab for social programs. “I know they’re going to be asked to do more in my state,” he said. But, Owen cautioned that it is neither realistic nor wise to replace government altogether. At a time when priorities and dollars shift rapidly to the “issue of the day,” Owen said only a full partnership, involving the public, corporate and philanthropic sectors, can likely ensure that funding and attention stay focused on service-related initiatives.

One audience member voiced her strong support for a continued partnership, saying there

are important roles for each sector to play. “I think that the private sector is very, very good at supporting and funding new ideas and new strategies,” she said. “But I think once we see what is working...then it is in the public’s interest for the public dollars to be spent to sustain that strategy.”

Commentary

The discussion suggests that further efforts are needed to reach consensus on a viable and sustainable funding mix for service. The public seems to be split on the issue right now—with some groups calling on the national government to relinquish its role entirely, while others identify the federal government as a crucial player. The Grantmaker Forum believes there is a need for a strong public-private partnership—rooted in each sector’s strengths—and will continue efforts to share its perspective on this crucial issue.

Question #6:

Can stipended service contribute to racial harmony through dialogue and shared experience?

Discussion

Deputy Mayor Daudon commented: “One argument that has been made for stipended service is that it enables people from all economic backgrounds to have an opportunity to serve. The President has said that he sees service as a strategy for addressing community problems of all kinds, including as a strategy for working out issues of racial tension.” She asked: “Does this make sense? Do you believe a

national service program like AmeriCorps is capable of making such a contribution to racial harmony? Is it happening now? Where and how?"

Senator Wofford strongly endorsed national service as a tool for addressing racism. He said that AmeriCorps, like the U.S. military before it, could play a pivotal role in bringing people of different races and backgrounds together. "I agree completely with...the President," he said. "We've got to go beyond dialogue about race to working together, toiling together." In fact, Senator Wofford said, exit interviews with AmeriCorps members show that the program is making a difference; the experience of working in diverse groups is routinely cited as the most satisfying part of the AmeriCorps experience. The CityYear program also finds it to be the top recruiting draw, Senator Wofford said.

Father Sullivan said he sees some potential for AmeriCorps to improve race relations in this country. "I agree that having a group of people from different races work together on a project is far superior to having them sit around a table and talk about their differences," he said. But, he cautioned, the potential gains can only be realized if service programs are carefully structured. "You have (to have) really skillful leadership that knows how to bring differences to the surface and identify commonalities and so on," he said. "Careful guidance and careful reflection (are needed) to get at a problem that is as deep a problem in American society as racism." If not, he warned, tensions and misunderstandings could, in fact, increase.

Deputy Mayor Daudon then broadened the discussion, asking Peter Blomquist what is needed to generate political will to support community service. Given the federal

government's reluctance right now to support progressive social programs, Blomquist said, he thinks there are two immediate needs: 1) the development of a strategic political plan, and 2) a commitment from the private and philanthropic community to get organized and voice their opinions. "My suggestion would be that maybe it's time to take the next step and say, okay, who are the opponents of national service, what are the constituencies, how do they break out, and how can we influence the decisions that are made by the people who are elected?"

Senator Wofford offered other strategies for building support. Lowering per-AmeriCorps member costs, for example, has helped the Corporation win support from key congressional leaders, he said. Support at the state level has also been a plus, Wofford added, citing recent gubernatorial and/or legislative backing to expand AmeriCorps programs in Washington, California, Minnesota and Massachusetts.

Commentary

The first part of this discussion points to the need for deeper reflection on the role a national and community service program can play in tackling racial ills. Are there, for example, models that provide the type of sophisticated leadership and guidance cited by Father Sullivan? The discussion on political will raises equally sensitive issues. Does the service community need to launch a political strategy to build support in Washington, D.C.? Can this be done without engaging in a divisive and potentially damaging battle with important political leaders?

Question #7:

What more can be done by each sector to support and strengthen service?

Discussion

The discussion culminated with Deputy Mayor Daudon's inquiry: "What more can be done to advance this ethic of giving of oneself for the betterment of others? What more can business do? What more can our systems of education do? What more can state government do? Finally, what more can the federal government do to promote the ethic of service and the opportunity to serve?"

Peter Blomquist launched the response to this question. Companies, he said, need to build constituencies through their businesses. "Starbucks Coffee Company, for example, has the opportunity to bring the message of citizen service to its six million weekly customers," he said. As for foundations, Blomquist said, "it may be time to begin awarding grants to try to influence opinions about service. In President's Kennedy inaugural address...there was a vision and that vision moved people," he said. "(We) need a vision for service. We need articulate people all over the country talking about it."

Father Sullivan focused on education, calling on schools to redouble their efforts to provide positive service experiences for as many students as possible. That, according to Father Sullivan, means putting in place the incentives and structures that encourage students to volunteer, then taking the time to recognize and appreciate their achievements. He added one other piece of advice: when structuring

programs for students, recognize that the most important potential gains are in individual growth, not community gains. "You're trying to produce experiences that are positive, that are self-affirming, that give a sense of achievement," Father Sullivan said.

Senator Wofford called on the federal government to focus long-term on providing the five fundamental resources for the nation's children as identified by General Colin Powell's America's Promise:

- providing a tutor, mentor or coach for every child in-need;
- increasing after school, non-school hour programs;
- ensuring a healthy start and access to health care;
- committing to effective education; and
- encouraging every young person to serve.

The Corporation for National Service, in partnership with nonprofits, states, schools and others, is making a difference, Wofford said, but there are other innovative steps to take. The Corporation, for example, should offer an AmeriCorps or VISTA member to every school that makes a meaningful commitment to service learning. And colleges need to respond to Congress' requirement that more students satisfy their work study requirement off-campus, through community service projects.

"(We) need a vision for service. We need articulate people all over the country talking about it."

Peter Blomquist
Director, Starbucks Foundation

Lieutenant Governor Owen offered the final comments, citing the broad role state governments can play in supporting service, from launching volunteer programs that help children learn how to read, to partnering with nonprofits looking to piggyback on state and local government resources, to honoring youth service achievements. He also encouraged state and local officials to make the most of their bully pulpits. “Many of us in government...give hundreds and hundreds of presentations each year,” Owen said. “At each one of those, we have the opportunity to try to influence associations, organizations and individuals to be involved in what we are talking about today. And we should do that.”

Commentary

There is no shortage of next steps for those private and public entities eager to strengthen the role of service in America today. As different sectors pursue goals, it is crucial that lessons and approaches are shared. The Grantmaker Forum encourages businesses and foundations to join these efforts—helping to assess, promote and reshape the field and role of service.

V. Conclusion

The Seattle conversation on service provided a special opportunity for a cross-sector dialogue. It engaged the region’s leading voices and practitioners in a discussion on current issues facing the field of service. Predictably, the discussion revealed a range of opinions on some key areas. But, most importantly, it demonstrated a shared belief among all the

panelists in the important difference that service can make and is making in communities.

The session also reaffirmed the Grantmaker Forum’s commitment to continue to support and foster these regional discussions. The gathering demonstrated the significant value of bringing players together around issues of common interest and concern, drawing links between federal policies and goals and on-the-ground realities across the country.

The Grantmaker Forum believes that all levels of government—federal, state and local—and all sectors—public, private, philanthropic and nonprofit—need to be engaged in the process of crafting a wise and effective national policy on service. The Seattle dialogue—the first of its kind—was successful for accomplishing just that. The Grantmaker Forum looks forward to sponsoring additional regional dialogues as part of its ongoing effort to build a viable and meaningful commitment to service across the country.

“We can, in new ways, in a more complicated time, crack the atom of civic power, and take a problem like the crisis of children and youth and...get things done to solve (it). I think that, in fact, is the essence of the new drive for national service.”

Honorable Harris Wofford
CEO, Corporation for National Service

Appendix A

Sponsors

THE HENRY M. JACKSON FOUNDATION

Since its establishment in 1983, the Henry M. Jackson Foundation has committed more than \$9 million to nonprofit organizations and educational institutions in the United States and abroad, focusing on new initiatives in four areas in which Senator Jackson played a key leadership role during his forty-three year tenure in Congress: education and advanced research in international affairs, public service, environment and natural resources management, and human rights.

GRANTMAKER FORUM ON COMMUNITY AND NATIONAL SERVICE

The Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service, founded in 1993, is comprised of over seven hundred private and family foundations bound together by a belief that service is the core value of American democracy and is best achieved through a partnership between the public, private, nonprofit and philanthropic sectors. The Forum's purpose is to build awareness of the power of volunteering and service as strategies for community problem solving—to make life better for all people.

Co-Sponsors

WASHINGTON COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND NATIONAL SERVICE

The Washington Commission, established in 1994 by Governor Mike Lowry, builds and expands a statewide ethic of service by inviting Washingtonians of all ages and backgrounds to contribute their time and talents to improve their communities. The Commission implements AmeriCorps programs throughout the state, sets priorities for results-oriented community service programs; provides training and technical assistance; evaluates service programs; and leverages federal program dollars with additional local, state and private sector resources. It also promotes the integration of service into educational, business, community and governmental agencies and programs as a means to address critical local needs, achieve national goals, and promote global understanding.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST GRANTMAKERS FORUM

The Pacific Northwest Grantmakers Forum is an association of grantmakers who fund throughout the five-state region of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington. To promote effective philanthropy among Northwest grantmakers, PNGF provides opportunities for the exchange of information and insights regarding philanthropic decision-making among grantmaking peers. Services include conferences, professional development workshops, gatherings of grantmakers who share funding interests and meetings focused on specific issues. PNGF members reflect a diversity of philanthropy interests and a wide range of grantmaking experiences and capabilities.

VOLUNTEER CENTER OF UNITED WAY KING COUNTY

The Volunteer Center of United Way King County provides a range of services designed to strengthen our communities. They include volunteer referral to community nonprofit organizations, placement of skilled volunteer consultants to address specific management issues in nonprofit organizations, training for nonprofit agency staff and volunteers, board of director training, and placement services. The Center also provides support to companies through group and individual opportunities.

Appendix B

Panelists

HONORABLE HARRIS WOFFORD

CEO, Corporation for National Service

Since helping to launch the Peace Corps in 1961, Harris Wofford has been in the forefront of the nation's service movement. As Pennsylvania's Secretary of Labor and Industry, he established and led the Office of Citizen Service. He was a key participant in writing the legislation that became the National and Community Service Act of 1990, and as a U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, was instrumental in drafting and passing the National and Community Service Trust Act, which created AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National Service. Appointed CEO of the Corporation for National Service by President Clinton in 1995, Senator Wofford has played a critical role in building the bipartisan spirit of national service.

FATHER WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN, S.J.

Chancellor, Seattle University

Father William Sullivan served as President of Seattle University from 1976 to 1996. Highlights of his twenty year tenure include the opening of the Seattle University School of Law, a new School of Theology and Ministry, an increase in the University's endowment from \$6.9 million to \$84.2 million, and consistently increasing enrollment levels. Long interested in the juxtaposition of service and higher education, Father Sullivan was instrumental in the founding of Campus Compact, the national association of colleges and universities committed to the integration of service into the educational experience. In January 1998, Father Sullivan was named Chancellor of Seattle University.

PETER BLOMQUIST

Director, Starbucks Foundation

Peter Blomquist's thirteen years of working for CARE, the international relief and development organization, made him an excellent candidate for the directorship of the Starbucks Foundation. He began at Starbucks as the Foundation's first director in March 1997, and has been busy ever since, crafting the mission, focus and infrastructure of a corporate foundation. While at CARE's Northwest office, he established a corporate partnership with Starbucks and built successful relationships with Westin Hotels and Resorts, Microsoft, Boeing and REI. In over twenty years of nonprofit work, he has traveled the world and is fortunate to be able to combine his two passions—the outdoors and nonprofit philanthropy—by conceiving and implementing Mt. Kilimanjaro's *Climb for CARE*, now in its third year.

HONORABLE BRAD OWEN

Lieutenant Governor, State of Washington

Elected lieutenant governor in 1996, Lieutenant Governor Owen began his career in public service with election to Washington’s House of Representatives in 1976. He moved to the State Senate in 1984, where he chaired the Natural Resources Committee for eight years and the Transportation Committee for four years. He views the role of lieutenant governor as critical to the state’s legislative process and is committed to supporting a climate of dignity and professionalism in the legislature and creating an environment where the economic and social concerns of all citizens are thoughtfully addressed. The focus of Owen’s work is building and enhancing diverse partnerships within our communities to attain safe, supportive and nurturing environments for youth. This effort has included visiting over two hundred Washington schools and promoting the aggressive child advocacy/drug prevention program that he developed and founded in 1989: Strategies for Youth, a nonprofit that provides violence and drug prevention education.

Moderator

HONORABLE MAUD SMITH DAUDON

Deputy Mayor, City of Seattle

Maud Smith Daudon serves as one of Mayor Paul Schell’s two Deputy Mayors. Her responsibilities include projects and issues related to public safety, public utilities and transportation, as well as oversight of budget and finance issues. She leads Mayor Schell’s initiative to review current city services and practices to ensure that taxpayers get the most value for their investment. Daudon is the former Chief Financial Officer for the Port of Seattle. Prior to joining the Port, she was an investment banker with Shearson Lehman Brothers, Inc. Daudon holds a Master’s Degree in Public and Private Management from the Yale School of Organization and Management and a Bachelor’s Degree from Hampshire College.

The Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service

c/o BTW Consultants - informing change
2560 Ninth Street, Suite 217
Berkeley, CA 94710-2500
Phone: (510) 665-6130
Fax: (510) 665-6129