

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE IMPACT AND FUTURE OF AMERICORPS

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, May 13, 2008

**Introduction:**

LAEL BRAINARD, Vice President and Director  
Global Economy and Development  
The Brookings Institution

**Moderator:**

E.J. DIONNE JR., Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

**Special Guests:**

HONORABLE GWEN MOORE (D-Wis.)  
United States Congress

HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER SHAYS (R-Conn.)  
United States Congress

**Panel Presentations:**

DAVID EISNER, Chief Executive Officer  
Corporation for National and Community Service

PAUL C. LIGHT  
Paulette Goddard Professor of Public Service  
New York University;  
Nonresident Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

ROXANNE SPILLETT, President and CEO  
Boys and Girls Clubs of America

JANET MURGUIA, President and CEO  
Council of La Raza

**Concluding Remarks:**

STEPHEN GOLDSMITH, Chairman of the Board  
Corporation for National and Community Service;  
Daniel Paul Professor of Government  
Harvard University

## PROCEEDINGS

DR. BRAINARD: I'm delighted to welcome everybody here today. We are also particularly delighted to be co-hosting with the Corporation for National Community Service this event in honor of this year's AmeriCorps Week. I think everybody in this room is already a convert to the tremendous power and impact of volunteers and of service around this country particularly in communities around the country, but also at Brookings we look at the impact of volunteers and service around the world and I think both domestically and internationally our imaginations have really been taken with just the enormous impact both on the people who are performing service, but also on the communities in which they serve.

We have a fantastic lineup today, and we're particularly honored to have two members of Congress who are leaders in this area, Representative Gwen Moore, and Representative Chris Shays. My part of Brookings is the Global Economy & Development program and so you might ask -- why am I introducing this event? We actually have a very active international coalition here at Brookings that started with a few meetings and developed into the Brookings Initiative on International Volunteering & Service. This initiative is essentially focused on taking that same power of the nongovernmental, the private sector, which

AmeriCorps has really captured and catalyzed, to the global stage. There is already a lot of activity out there which we have been researching and amplifying, but we are hoping that over the course of the next several years our efforts together with a number of leaders on the Hill will double the number of International volunteers from 50,000 to 100,000. So again, we see this as hugely impactful here at home, but also abroad.

I am now going to turn the podium over to E.J. Dionne who is sometimes here at Brookings, sometimes at the *Washington Post*, sometimes at Georgetown, and spectacular in all arenas. I think all of you know him as somebody who is always out ahead of the curve in terms of discerning trends in American public attitudes. He was the editor of *United We Serve* which got out ahead of the national service and civic activity curve, and I think he is very much focused on revitalization of service and civic life in America. So, I can think of no better person to lead this panel. Over to you, E.J.

DR. DIONNE: Congresswoman Moore is a very shrewd judge of human beings. He noticed Lael's name comes out of Superman-Superwoman comics, and Lael is a superwoman and I am very honored to be here with her. Her interest in this subject given where she comes from is the ultimate proof that there is a lot of practicality to the slogan "think globally, act locally," and in some sense that's what this is about.

I want to speak very quickly about AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National Service because I view this as a great program; it is one of my favorite programs and also a political miracle. And I do not think we fully appreciate what a political miracle it is. This was President Clinton's idea and it survived one of the most divisive periods in our country's history, through the Clinton impeachment, through President Bush's administration. It survived because a lot of discerning people on both sides were willing to come to its defense. In the Clinton years, people such as Congressman Shays and Steve Goldsmith and Les Lankowsky stood up for national service when it came under attack. President Bush has chosen to continue this program and give it life. David Eisner pointed out to me that the recent appropriation passed the committee 44 to nothing. So, after a long period of divisiveness, I think this is well established.

I think it's well established because I can think of very few programs that draw more effectively on insights from liberals, from moderates, and from conservatives. The liberal insight if you will is that government is capable of acting and that collective action is capable of improving society. The conservative insight is that we need to strengthen in every way we can the voluntary sector in our society and the institutions of civil society. The moderate inspiration is it's good to do whatever you

can to solve public problems. Of course, many liberals, many conservatives, and many moderates believe all three of these things. I think this program is based on one other insight, that preserving a healthy democracy requires not only a nation of strivers, not only economic growth, but a commitment to service to common and public virtue, and I think all the programs associated with the Corporation for National Service and AmeriCorps reflect that.

The last thing that one must say is it's an extraordinary new generation out there. All the studies of the so-called millennials suggest that they are really different from the rest of us and they're different from the rest of us in a whole series of good ways. I won't belabor that except to say I really do believe this new generation is going to be one of the great reforming generations in our country's history.

It's a great honor to be joined by Congresswoman Gwen Moore and Congressman Chris Shays. Congresswoman Moore was sworn in as Representative from Wisconsin's 4th Congressional District in January 2005. I have these extraordinarily long bios which are only part of their lives, but I will just say that she is a member of the House Committee on Small Business, the House Committee on Financial Services, and she joined the powerful House Budget Committee in her second term. She's also been a leader on world affairs. She's been a U.S. Delegate to the

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, its Parliamentary Assembly. She's been on the Parliamentary Network of the World Bank. Financial Services Chair Barney Frank appointed her to that point, and she works with other parliamentary groups around the world. She also was a co-sponsor of the Shield Act signed into law during the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act to ensure that victims of domestic violence who flee their abuser cannot be tracked and found through HUD's management system. And she has brought home a lot of money to her district. I'm sure none of those things were earmarks. We don't call good money earmarks.

She was born in Racine in 1951 and raised in Milwaukee. She is the eighth of nine children. Her dad was a factory worker. Her mother was a public school teacher, as was my mother. I love teachers. She is the mother of three, the grandmother of three, all of whom live in Wisconsin's 4th Congressional District which much be extremely helpful to you.

Congressman Chris Shays has been an independent advocate in Congress since 1987. He is the last Republican member of the House of Representatives from New England. The Republican Leader of the State Senate in Massachusetts when he was down to 7 out of 40 had a little sign on his wall that said "Not a minority, but a chosen few,"

and Chris Shays can say he is the chosen one among us. He is the Senior Member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and Ranking Member of the National Security and Foreign Affairs Subcommittee. He also serves on Financial Services and the Homeland Security Committee. He is the first member of Congress to enter Iraq after the fall of Saddam's government. He has been to Iraq 20 times and he helped create the Iraq Study Group. He helped create the 9/11 Commission. He is well known for being part of pairs, Shays-Meehan being one of the most important. I think there's been no more a stalwart advocate of campaign finance reform and lobby disclosure legislation. He is a national leader on environmental issues. He co-chairs the National Service Caucus and is the recipient of the National Service Lifetime Leadership Award from Friends of National Service. That's a really powerful lobby group with millions and millions of dollars to spend for his lifelong dedication to citizen service and he embodies that ethic of public service himself.

I bring you first Congresswoman Moore, and then Congressman Shays; and we're really honored to have you both with us today. Congresswoman Moore?

CONGRESSWOMAN MOORE: Thank you so much, E.J., and thank you, Lael and David Eisner, and all of you for the opportunity to

share with you briefly my experience with national service. Specifically, I was a VISTA Volunteer, and even though I found myself becoming the recipient of VISTA Volunteer of the Decade from 1976 to 1986, I didn't start out aspiring to have that distinction. I started out as a very frustrated member of a community where services to low-income communities were nonexistent. What my project was was to develop a Community Development Credit Union from scratch based on our having continued to lobby the banking community in our community, the insurance companies in our community, lobbying them to provide services to our community, services without usury rates which was something more than just transaction centers, for them to follow the Community Reinvestment Act protocol. And after marching, writing letters, protesting, we decided as a community, I was a member on welfare with three kids, I was on the board of a neighborhood association, and we made the decision that would apply for a VISTA grant to try to redress the lack of credit within our community.

The frustration for me was very, very personal. I had a washer and drier at about a 28 percent interest rate from one of these sort of rent-to-own type venues. The repo man came out and took my washer and drier right out of my basement right at a point in which I'd probably paid for it four times. So I began to organize in my community and we

developed a source of credit. As a matter of fact, just yesterday I was in that Community Development Credit Union in Milwaukee which has merged with the corporate community still there providing services to low-income people in a low-income neighborhood.

My daughter went on to become a VISTA and she worked in a homeless shelter with kids and from that experience she had developed a tremendous passion and capability for dealing with early childhood education. She is very, very gifted in this area, but she was inspired by her national service as a VISTA.

I have a nephew who is a vice president of Public Ally located in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. And the thing about national service is that while there's a lot of focus on helping communities in distress, that community was unable to have credit on reasonable terms in my case, that community where homelessness among families had evolved and erupted into a major problem, those communities where gangs and gang membership are threats to the very life of the community, the really important thing is that public service did so much more for us as human beings within those communities. However much good it did, it grew us as human beings, helped us deepen the compassion that we had for people, gave us this third eye and this vision for what's needed.

I heard E.J. describe the travails of national service during the Clinton years, but my recollection is that before AmeriCorps, VISTA endured threats of being cut and slashed and burned from the very beginning. It was a creature of the Johnson Administration that has been under constant assault. I think that there has been an undue fear of what developing compassion has among young people. We have seen movements around the world that engage young people in an adversarial and negative way, but public service through these programs takes that youth and that energy and that zeal and the power and the imagination and energy and directs it toward doing good within the community. This is the lesson and the takeaway that we need for public service.

I remember the VISTA poster that came out during my year of public service. It said, "If we can't find a way, we will make a way." Indeed, that was my challenge. My first day in my VISTA program I asked where's the paper and where are the paperclips, and my sponsor just kind of looked at me and said there are no papers, there are no paperclips, there are no staplers, there are no desk. You've got to make all this stuff happen yourself. So thank you so much national service, thank you so much Brookings Institution for this forum to talk about the extreme importance of national service not only to our country, to our world, but to

the individual growth and development of our young people. Thank you so very much.

CONGRESSMAN SHAYS: It's very nice to hear from Gwen and to see the impact it's had on her, and she's having a great impact in Congress because of her life experiences of which national service was part. Thank you all for being here.

I feel almost like I'm in a church looking down a cathedral here. I was also thinking if Eli Segal hadn't designed the program this way, there wouldn't be as many of you. What he did when he had the opportunity to create AmeriCorps was he reached out to Republicans and we really thought that when we created AmeriCorps that you would see a tremendous amount of Republican support because what he did was he listened to those of us who were trying to provide input on the Republican side of the aisle. We were all committed to national service but we didn't want a one size fits all. In other words, one of the views was let's enlarge VISTA and we'll have a large VISTA program and this has it's role. But what he decided to do with his people and what the President decided to do was to have this have a local and state focus. It was a kind of courageous thing because it meant that the federal government would not have the kind of control on these programs. It meant you would see some really great programs and you might see some really bad ones. The really

bad ones wouldn't stay in, they'd get cloned out, they'd be taken out, but it was an effort to say let's have this creativity, let's have this almost competitive model that would allow people to step forward and say I'd like to see AmeriCorps volunteers involved here, I'd like to see volunteers here, and to allow the states to take charge over national service was I think a pretty bold move on the part of the President.

What didn't happen, and this is to my regret speaking as a Republican, was that Republicans in Congress didn't embrace it. The reason why is Republicans started to take the position that this really wasn't volunteerism because they were being paid. I love that logic, minimum wage plus a stipend for your further education. What was very puzzling to me was H.W. Bush was promoting national service. He was really promoting national service, Points of Light and so on, let's get people involved, and President Clinton took the national service effort and said we should be expanding it. He thought there would be consensus. Republicans took the position you don't pay volunteers. It was almost like there was going to be a created movement under the Democratic Party that would unite all these young people and make Democrats out of them, candidly. So what we found was that rather than seeing the kind of support within the Republican Party that we thought we would see, there

wasn't a majority of Republicans who supported the AmeriCorps model, and that was a huge disappointment to me.

To the credit of President Clinton and to Eli Segal, they didn't back away from all the input that Republicans had made to make this program. I think it is a stunning outcome, an absolutely stunning outcome. I tried to explain to my Republican colleagues who would listen that I was a Peace Corps volunteer that was paid a living wage so I could eat. I had a house supplied to me. Then I was given a small stipend when I left. The only thing it enabled me to do, it was so small was to buy underwear and things like that because when you wash underwear on rocks for 2 years you don't want to come back here and wear them.

But what was also stunning to me was think about the logic that we were having to contend with. Republicans tend to believe that you should earn what you get. So instead of a grant for school, you were earning a grant for school. Republicans were told that you want to create a young population that learns the value of the ethic of work. And here you were having mentors taking AmeriCorps volunteers, some of them candidly who had never worked before because we got rid of a lot of jobs programs and so on who were now being given a program to be employed to have a mentor to help explain how you would do this, and then through your initiative you took off. So everything about this program in my

judgment encompasses what Republicans tend to value and yet it became a political issue, and that's I think something we're starting to overcome except in the reauthorization bill we needed two-thirds to get through the suspension calendar and we missed it by one vote. What we wanted to do after having this law in effect for many years was to have \$4,725 annual dollars not given you in cash like I was given as a Peace Corps volunteer, but given to you as you improved yourself from a job and volunteerism to now going on to school, we wanted to increase that to \$5,225. We're going to get it done, but we still don't have that kind of consensus that we need. We can have more than 50,000 AmeriCorps volunteers, national service volunteers. That is just frankly a no-brainer.

I'll end by saying that when we dealt with the Crime Bill way back, when I met with my chiefs of police from Stamford, to Norwalk, to Bridgeport, they said to me more police would be helpful, more prisons is a bad omen, but if you really want to impact, have meaningful activities for young people. Tell me something that is more meaningful than AmeriCorps. I can't think of it. I can't think of it. Tell me something more meaningful than having a young person who is going to be employed, or an older person, be an activist, helping their fellow citizens. This is a quote that I've often thought about. We tend to think that Kennedy was here and Ronald Reagan was here, and I don't like the concept that

government is the bad player and that's the downside of Ronald Reagan. But when you think about it when Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country," that couldn't fit in more to the concept of being of service. And frankly, even Ronald Reagan was saying, "What can you do for your country and your fellow people, not what can your country do for you." So I think some people have misinterpreted what Ronald Reagan had said to fit their kind of ideology that they want to be arguing for. So let me now just say in a very positive note you are my heroes. You are doing something very important for our country. And if I came here for no other reason than to just say these words, I would have come, thank you.

DR. DIONNE: I want to thank Congressman Shays and Congresswoman Moore, and I want to thank Congressman Shays for mentioning Eli Segal who was clearly a wonderful human being, a great American, and somebody who was tough when he needed to be and one of the warmest people I've ever met.

CONGRESSMAN SHAYS: He's one of my heroes.

DR. DIONNE: Me too. This is the best organized event I ever MC'd at Brookings. I have this very detailed set of instructions here. I want to ask the organizer if I can break with the program in just one respect which is I want to ask each of them the same question which is in

this campaign with John McCain, with Barack Obama, and with Hillary Clinton, you have three candidates who over a long history have been very committed to the idea of national service and who have proposed various expansions. I just wanted to ask each of you if the next President called you up the day after the election and said I want to expand AmeriCorps, I want to do more with this program, what would you tell him or her? Either of you can take that first.

CONGRESSWOMAN MOORE: I'd just say how can I help you?

DR. DIONNE: That's efficient. Do you have any thoughts on where this should go, on what areas you'd like it to go in? I don't to get in the way of your efficiency.

CONGRESSMAN SHAYS: The unbelievable genius of AmeriCorps is it's not one program. It's not one size fits all. You will have some programs that will be outstanding and you will have some programs that will not be. And we will have the courage to say we will risk the criticism of a bad program for a year and we'll get rid of it. So there's no limit, frankly, to how large this program can be because it's local based, it's state based, it's not a one size fits all national program. So the sky's the limit.

CONGRESSWOMAN MOORE: I think it's absolutely amazing, and this had occurred to me when I realized who the final contenders were, that national service was something that was going to be protected. There are so many needs in our country. We are so blessed as a country when you look at us vis-à-vis other parts of the world. But there are still many challenges here. We have a great many problems with maternal-child well-being, we have the problem of gangs developing, and as my colleague Mr. Shays mentioned, crime escalating, drug addiction and affliction. We have real challenges as it relates to being relevant in a global economy and we find so many states that are unable to adequately finance their educational systems. There are so many things to be done, and I think Mr. Shays has made a major point in that every project has to have a local focus like my project. There has got to be a reason that people are working on that particular project at that particular time. You have rural communities, you have urban communities, and not only that, these programs engage elders, seniors, grandparents to the projects, young people, people who have greater resources than other people, peer relationships. I think an expansion of AmeriCorps would be just the thing that we need to reassure Americans that somebody really cares about you, that you have not been forgotten.

As I listen to some of the campaign rhetoric from all three of the contenders, what feedback they constantly say is that they think Americans feel that folks have forgotten them, that people don't realize that they are up against tough times, whether it be lack of a health care program, lack of activities for young people, no resources for our Boys and Girls Clubs, needing to develop new skill sets for the global economy, there is so much to do, and there is nothing I think that would give a greater shot in the arm to our economy and to our confidence than an expansion of the national service institutions.

DR. DIONNE: Want to thank our Members of Congress. I go to a lot of these events and I always think what would be the distorted direct mail piece of tabloid headline, and I was thinking, "Republican Congressman Endorses Unlimited Big Government; the Sky's the Limit He Says." I want to thank you for your courage for proposing that today. It's certainly been great to have Congresswoman Moore and Congressman Chris Shays.

CONGRESSMAN SHAYS: Thank you so much.

DR. DIONNE: Now the panelists are going to come and under my detailed instructions we're going to array everyone around here and I'm going to introduce David Eisner who is the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service which oversees

AmeriCorps, VISTA, the SeniorCorps, Learn and Serve America, and other domestic service programs. He came to the corporation in December 2003. He has expanded the reach of its programs and reduced administration burdens. And in addition to its ongoing grant making and program management, the corporation has overseen an unprecedented national service response for the Gulf Coast hurricanes. Today is leading the corporation in powerful alliances with other agencies, and he is also harnessing the skills of retiring baby-boomers, a group of which I have increasing interest as the years go by and trying to bring greater numbers of Americans.

Before he joined the corporation he was an executive with AOL and AOL Time Warner where he oversaw the AOL Foundation and became a nationally recognized leader on nonprofit capability building infrastructure and organizational effectiveness. He is a graduate of Stanford and received a law degree from the Georgetown University Law Center, lives in Maryland with his wife Lori and their four young children all of whom will join AmeriCorps some day. Welcome.

MR. EISNER: Thank you, E.J., and thank you for your longstanding leadership of national service. Lael, thank you. I have to thank all the Members who have spoken, the folks on our panel who will speak, and of course my board chairman Steve Goldsmith. I am our poor

replacement for Bob Grimm this morning who was to come here and deliver a few nuggets of information that we've recently gleaned from a longitudinal survey of AmeriCorps members.

Before I get to that, let me just back up for a moment. I'm as E.J. said the CEO of the Corporation for National and Community Service. The corporation as you heard from our Members of Congress was created by President Clinton, but really a lot of the programs in it started a lot earlier. We have our SeniorCorps programs that were started in the 1960s and 1970s, Learn and Service America, we have small programs like MLK Day that Congress asked us to turn into a day of service, we have the AmeriCorps portfolio. In the AmeriCorps portfolio there are really three pieces, VISTA which Congresswoman Moore came from which was created by President Johnson and which I should note that under the corporation has doubled in size. We have our state and national grants which is a competitive program that Congressman Shays was talking about. And we have the NCCC which is a small, about 1,200 member residential core of folks who do a lot of disaster preparedness and disaster response work and they operate out of five campuses and they have their own regions.

Across AmeriCorps we have 75,000 members. President Bush has expanded that from 50,000 before his administration, to 75,000,

a 50 percent increase, and I'm delighted that this year we're going to hit that 75,000 number. Since 1994 we've had 540,000 alums or members come through AmeriCorps. The study I'm going to talk about today is limited to two parts of AmeriCorps, that is, the grants program and NCCC.

When you think in terms of evaluation of AmeriCorps, we're always looking for four kinds of outcomes. We want to make sure that we are benefiting the beneficiaries, the families or the children or the people coming out of prison, the people with challenges that we're trying to serve. The first outcome is that we want to sure we're actually serving and providing long-term impacts to our beneficiaries. Secondly, we want to make sure that we're strengthening the communities and the organizations that support those communities. So we want to make sure whether they're small faith-based or community organizations, or large organizations like Youth Crops or City -- or Habitat or Campfire, that we are strengthening those organizations. Third, we're trying to have an impact on the culture of service. So the third set of impacts is what's happening to national volunteering as a result of our national service programs. The fourth area of impact is on the people who are serving. The study that we're talking about today is about that impact, what is the impact on the person who signed up to be an AmeriCorps member? What

long-term changes in their life occur as a result of having been an AmeriCorps member?

On behalf of the corporation I'm pleased to present today the first definitive, rigorous longitudinal study that we've ever had access to that gives us conclusive data on what is the long-term impact on someone who has had a year of AmeriCorps service. We should note that this data is very important to understand what the future of AmeriCorps needs to be, but it turns out after we've seen the data that it's also really important for the future of America's nonprofits and the public agencies that serve especially as they face a looming crisis in a workforce shortage and a leadership shortage.

The study focuses on two problems, what's the efficacy of AmeriCorps on the people who serve? And secondly, how do we solve this social crisis where we have management and leadership shortfalls in our nonprofit and government sectors?

Just to run through the basics, the study is the culmination of an 8-year study to evaluate what is the impact. We've achieved the study by comparing pre-service and post-service habits both of 2,000 of AmeriCorps members and of a similarly situated comparison group. The comparison group is key. Many people when they see this study will say of course we saw these impacts. These folks were already situated to be

highly engaged, that's why they joined AmeriCorps, which is why we created this rigorous comparison group of folks who were also likely to volunteer. In fact, most of the members of the comparison group actually applied to be in AmeriCorps and for one reason or another were not so that we know that their volunteering and their demographics were the same.

For this comparison group, researchers controlled for any factors that might influence the study outcomes, demographic characteristics, economic status, prior service, volunteering, doing everything that we need to do to make sure that we can conclusively say that the differences we're seeing in the study are specifically the result of AmeriCorps. Here's what the study reveals. Four big areas. First, it turns out that AmeriCorps is a pipeline to careers in public service. What's really interesting, it turns out that alumni from racial and ethnic minority groups and from disadvantaged circumstances are even more likely than others to go into public service careers as compared to their colleagues in this comparison group. It also turns out that AmeriCorps alums are more likely to be engaged in their communities and taking part in civic activities. And the final result which is really amazing is it turns out that AmeriCorps alums are more satisfied with their lives. Eight years after service they're

more satisfied with their lives than similarly situated peers in the comparison group.

Let me just drill into those findings for a couple of minutes. We're looking at more than 60 percent of the alums from AmeriCorps are today 8 years later working to build better communities by serving in government or in nonprofit organizations. That's compared to just over 40 percent of the members of the control group. It turns out that 80 percent of members say that their service exposed them to new career options, that's 83 percent for NCCC, 79 percent for the grantee members, which may be the reason that we see more AmeriCorps members going into these fields because AmeriCorps service exposed them to it. It also turns out that more than two-thirds of AmeriCorps members say that AmeriCorps gave them a leg up, was advantageous for them in being able to get the jobs that they have.

A lot of alumni are more likely to be active in community activities. What's interesting is we're looking at more than a 15 percent difference in terms of participation in community activities, community meetings, and events. Members who served in AmeriCorps as I mentioned earlier say they are more satisfied with their lives 8 years later than individuals who did not end serving in AmeriCorps. In fact, 94 percent of NCCC and 86 percent of the members in our state and national

grants programs say they're satisfied with their lives and satisfied with their careers.

I mentioned earlier that AmeriCorps has an even greater effect on people from ethnic and racial minorities, and people from disadvantaged circumstances, just a couple more statistics. Hispanic AmeriCorps alums are significantly more likely than their comparison group, 56 percent versus 35 percent, to report that participation in neighborhood organizations is very important. The difference is about twice as strong within that demographic versus the nonminority, non-disadvantaged population. In addition, we see 79 percent of African Americans who participated in AmeriCorps state and national say that they have the ability to make a difference in their communities, compared to about 70 percent from the comparison group. Whereas across the board we see that AmeriCorps alums are about one-third more likely to go into public service careers than their counterparts, among African Americans and Latinos we see that they are 50 percent more likely to go into those careers. So it's really astonishing.

I want to wrap up just by noting that usually when you see these longitudinal studies it's very hard to identify and distinction. How many things have any of us done that 8 years later we can identify that experience 8 years ago is changing our behavior today? And for a lot of

studies that we've engaged in, we haven't seen any results, so these are particularly meaningful. I guess what they pose for the organization and for the national service community are two questions, what's the right way for us to use the data and go forward, and what's the right way to use AmeriCorps to make our society and our democracy stronger and to tackle some of your questions, and that's why I'm so glad that we have an opportunity to hear more from our panel. Thank you very much.

DR. DIONNE: I want to thank David, and I want to call up our panelists Roxanne Spillett and Janet Murguia, and I believe Paul Light is running late. Please have compassion for Paul because he does about a thousand things at the same time, so Paul will be here. Roxanne is here, Janet is here, and at this very carefully organized event I'm about 14.7 minutes behind schedule so far and so I will short intros to our distinguished panelists, but it doesn't do justice to their extraordinary careers.

Roxanne Spillett is the President and CEO of Boys and Girls Clubs of America, the nation's fastest-growing youth development organization and one of its most distinguished. She's done all kinds of things for the Boys and Girls Clubs, but what I liked best as I learned from her before is she came to take a temporary 8-month job 30 years ago to

help underprivileged people get access to health care, she came for 8 months and stayed for 30 years and rose to the top of the organization.

Janet is the President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Council of La Raza, the largest national Hispanic civil rights advocacy organization in the United States. She began her career with Congressman Jim Slattery. She worked in the White House from 1994 to 2000, worked on the Gore-Lieberman campaign and was at the University of Kansas. I just want to say there's this whole list of top fifties and top one hundreds she is on, and I'm just very excited to be sitting next to one of "Washingtonian" 's 100 Most Powerful Women in Washington, so it's a great honor to be with you. And I'll introduce Paul when he gets here.

What I'd like to ask you both to do, and I'll start to Roxanne, to respond to this report and perhaps to talk about its finding that a lot of AmeriCorps members do go into careers with nonprofit organizations and government. What's your relationship been with AmeriCorps? Have you brought on members as full-time staff? Does the training they're provided set them apart and in what ways? And again in both cases, your general perspectives on the program.

MS. SPILLETT: The study that David described rings true for Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and let me just give you a context for that. Our footprint is over 4,000 clubs, 50,000 full- and part-time staff.

We're in public housing, Native American lands. We're on military bases across the world. We're in urban, suburban, and rural environments. We have a great need for professionals in our field who are supplemented by volunteers. What we discovered with AmeriCorps is that they are in our system. I think at any given moment there's probably somewhere between 800 and 1,000 AmeriCorps workers in our system if you take the state program and the grant program together. So they do represent a significant number.

What AmeriCorps workers really contribute to Boys and Girls Clubs is they enable us to extend what we're doing so that in many cases they're conducting new programs in our clubs and they're conducting outreach programs for our clubs. In fact, in one of our clubs, there's an outreach program to a juvenile detention center where the AmeriCorps workers are taking Boys and Girls Clubs programs into the detention center. There are other kinds of programs that they run. We look for specialty people like people with a public health background to conduct public health or drug prevention programs in our clubs. They extend what we're doing in a very powerful and meaningful way. They serve as great role models and mentors for our kids in our clubs. And remember, our mission to serve all young people with a special focus on those who need us most and those from disadvantaged circumstances.

Thirdly, we are seeing AmeriCorps workers being employed by our clubs. We see it in Biloxi, we see it in Utah, and we're seeing it all over the country. So it is clear to me that this is a pipeline for further employees and future professionals. I remember going to our club in Pine Ridge in South Dakota, a brand new club. Pine Ridge is a Native American reservation about the size of Connecticut. That club is perhaps the only community kind of gathering for kids and has a pool, the only pool, but it has a beautiful technology center that really couldn't be staffed adequately, and the way it was staffed was through AmeriCorps workers who staffed that technology center and that learning center. So I do think a lot of the data that David said truly rings true in the Boys and Girls Clubs movement.

DR. DIONNE: Thank you. Janet, could you talk about the role of AmeriCorps with the Hispanic community? The demographics of our country are changing rapidly. There's large ongoing growth and projected growth in the Hispanic community. What sorts of opportunities have been available particularly within your community out of the AmeriCorps program?

MS. MURGUIA: Thank you, and thanks for hosting this panel. It's very informative and at NCLR we've been very proud to be partners with AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National and

Community Service and we've been partners since 1995 when we established our first NCLR-AmeriCorps project. Since that time, 1,500 NCLR-AmeriCorps members have served their communities through our community-based affiliates. At NCLR we represent largely 300 community-based organizations that serve the Hispanic community and other communities in providing services and sometimes advocacy. We understand that the growing demographics of our community require that we have more people from our community to engage our community and I think that becomes very important. Some of you may have seen the latest census numbers that came out on May 1 that represent the fact that now for every child under 5, 1 in 4 children is Hispanic in this country. For every child under 5, 1 in 4 children are Hispanic in this country. If you start playing that out, in the next 5 years there will be 5 to 10, in the next 5 years after that there will be 10 to 15. We've got a growing need to I think make sure that we have mechanisms to address those children and make sure that they're being served and I think through our projects at AmeriCorps which have largely focused on literacy, we have found that it's been tremendously helpful to have these members participating in communities and engaging in ways that not only these individuals in our communities can respond to, but because they also know often times dual languages and they seem fairly culturally competent in dealing with these

communities in understanding how to engage and reach out to many of these young people. We have found that to be especially important for our community.

So for us it's been very important because what we're also finding in many of our AmeriCorps projects are not just in the traditional states where you might imagine, but we go to from the heart of Texas to Amish country in Pennsylvania where we have large pockets of the Hispanic community now drawn by different forces in the economy. So we need to be in all the communities where we see those particular needs, so we want to be able to have that engagement. I think our experience reflects what the study has found as well and that is that many in our community are also finding that not only is this rewarding, but they're also seeing this as future careers for themselves in public service. When you think about it, and this is a report that has been out there now and the challenges of the nonprofit sector, I see Audrey Alverado out there and she knows all about that, but we have a leadership deficit, a talent deficit, when it comes to replacing so many who are running these community-based organizations right now. I can't think of a better pipeline to engage these folks and to expose them initially to public service and then to let them learn about the business of nonprofits, to let them learn about putting their values and their mission at work for the community.

Of course, that concept is not a new one for the Latino community. Part of much of the values of the Latino community is in giving back if you have benefited and we're seeing AmeriCorps as a key opportunity for us to channel that real strong sense of wanting to give back to you – the community in a more formal and organized way; and, for us, it's been very impactful to see that, again, in many of the literacy programs that have been extended not just the basic literacy but out at our Unity Council in California -- San Francisco -- they've used our AmeriCorps project participants in helping with financial literacy, if you will, in helping impact preparation for many in our community. Because what we have found is that when they go to get their income taxes done, they need help in making sure they can help navigate through that system; and, having these AmeriCorps folks be there to provide that kind of help and training, has been something that has allowed our folks to better understand from a financial literacy point things that help them make better decisions about what to do with some of those aspects of their financial areas. So we have found it to be something that has really paid off; and, in terms of the demographics, it couldn't be more timelier to have both engaged and exposed to this type of effort and being able to see a more formal process to channel those incredible values and that wanting to give back, and we seeing that, I think, manifested quite well in our AmeriCorps project.

DR. DIONNE: Thank you. And Paul Light, who specializes in just-in-time-delivery, I want to welcome you here. Paul earned his B.A. summa cum laude from McAlister College, Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. I don't think this is a complete list of the places he's taught at -- UVA, GU, Georgetown, University of Pennsylvania, University of Minnesota. He's currently teaching at Harvard University's Kennedy School. He was Director of the Public Policy Program at the Pew Charitable Trust where he gave away lots of money to lots of good people. He was the Vice President and Director of Governmental Studies here at Brookings and was thus my boss, which I can assure you was a thankless job. He is actually a very generous leader, and we really came to admire him here.

Paul writes books the way newspaper columnists produce columns; there is just one after another after another, and they were -- well, your mic is sort of hanging from the back of the chair. They are extremely good books, and Paul has really specialized in pointing out to us how we need to reinvigorate public service in our country, particularly government service; and your new book, which is sitting on my kitchen counter, is not listed on your bio and I want you to have a chance to plug the title of your new book which I read and is a great book. And I'm going to throw a question to you all at the same time with this introduction, which is to talk

about what you have written about so much, the public and nonprofit sector crisis, particularly the public sector crisis where there will be a shortfall of 640,000 people in the public sector alone. And could you talk about how AmeriCorps might help in producing the next generation of civic leaders and public leaders; and welcome home, Paul, it's good to have you back.

DR. LIGHT: It's great to be back. Can you hear me back there? That's great.

First of all, I want to say that this is a great piece of research. Now, we've got to get evidence on how these programs work, and we usually survey the participants and say, did you have a good time. And they always say, yeah, we had a good time and we don't have any control group. This is a very nice piece of research, well worth reading as an exemplar, of how we might evaluate how government performs in terms of really solid evidence that focuses on outcomes. Now, these are self-selected individuals. They are already highly motivated by the chance to make a difference. And I viewed them, as I read this evaluation, as part of the pipeline in the public service generally. These members of AmeriCorps clearly are motivated by the chance to do something meaningful with their lives, and they're willing to take a deep discount in support to so do. In fact, on the AmeriCorps website, there's a link to a

set of recommendations for AmeriCorps members on how to get through the year, which involves buying used clothes, taking transportation at off-peak hours, getting food from food pantries and so forth; it's efficient, perhaps a little bit too efficient.

So when I look at the AmeriCorps program, and I look at what's happening in government and I look at what's happening in the nonprofit sector, it is true that there's a leadership deficit; it is true that government, in particular, has become a career of last resort for many young people, except at the local level to a greater extent; and you see these young people coming through this pipeline, highly motivated by public service, clearly looking at the nonprofit sector as a destination, but I wonder whether or not government could also look at AmeriCorps members as a very efficient source of talent for government.

Now, we have to increase the number of members, wouldn't we, because we have a huge shortage in both sectors -- big baby boom wave -- and, incidentally, we've done research on state and local government, and the age waive in state and local government is also very, very significant. The average age of the state and local employee right now is 46 years old. Now, I happen to think that's not a bad age. I wish I were closer to it; but, you know, I'll get there -- well, maybe not. I have already passed that mark; but, at all levels of the public service, we desperately

need this talent. The only thing I'd recommend for AmeriCorps, perhaps, is career development services that help them -- members -- develop the skills so they can go immediately into the upper level of the nonprofit organizations that have this enormous turnover engine going on. And perhaps at some point the federal government will get with it and start to realize that there's this panel base out there for lateral entry, and that you don't have to go in at the beginning of a 30-year career; you can go right into a significant decision point, and that to me is a wonderful source of talent, an efficient source of talent. Lots of proposals out there about how to get young people interested in government. Do you remember Jerry Maguire where Cuba Gooding, Jr. says, "Show me the money"? Young people aren't saying show me the money; they're saying, "Show me the impact." And if we can do that in both nonprofit land and in government as well as in the private sector, where there are emergent social entrepreneurial activities, then we can view as a significant recruiting tool and at a very efficient price increase the number of potential public servants dramatically. How's that?

DR. DIONNE: Thank you. Why don't we tell everybody the title of your new book hot off the presses; it's a great book.

DR. LIGHT: It's titled, "A Government Ill-Executed." It's kind of a bummer of a title, but it comes from Alexander Hamilton's statement that a

government ill-executed, whatever it may be in practice, is bad government; and, if you look at the cascade of meltdowns over the last six or seven years -- eight, ten years -- you know, grounded aircraft, counterfeit heparin, problems with contracting, problems with recruiting, toxic trailers, toxic toys, tainted meat. I could on and on and you won't --

DR. DIONNE: You'll clear the room, Paul.

DR. LIGHT: Yeah, we'll clear the room. These are often treated as a series of unfortunate events but, in fact, they're linked. They are linked; and, if we connect the dots, what we see is a meltdown in the federal government's ability to execute the laws, and this book is about how to restore that capacity.

DR. DIONNE: And he say, as far as I remember, not a crossword about AmeriCorps in the entire book.

DR. LIGHT: Not even a slightest mention of any meltdowns in this fine program.

DR. DIONNE: Let me just throw out some questions -- I want to bring in the audience because we've got so many thought people who've been engaged in this work for a long time. Let me sort of put two questions together and toss them to David and to all of you.

The study focuses on what has happened after eight years of service. Do you we get any hints from the study of what to expect in a

longer time period, after 10 or 15 years of service. What is the expectation about the civic engagement of these folks, both for public work in government and, perhaps, even running for president one day.

And the other question I want to ask is, although AmeriCorps is largely focused on the 18-24 year old demographic, these are not all young students fresh out of school. Can you talk about the impact of people who are in their 30's and 40's. Why don't you take them both and I invite anyone else on the panel to jump in on that.

DR. LIGHT: Sure. So we actually had practiced at your question because, about four years ago, we did our first trench of research from this longitudinal study; and we tried to look at which things we thought might get stronger and which things -- and we were actually pretty bad at it. It turns out that there's a really good reason to do longitudinal data, which says you can't predict it before you get there. Nevertheless, there is one thing that we know, which is that the more intent and the more long term your service is, the more likely you are to continue it; so we're really confident that, at the eight-year mark, we know that we're not going to see significant drop-off of the numbers. What's really interesting to us is, as the longitudinal survey gets further out, whether we're going to start seeing people that might have been exposed to a year of service find others things to do 10-15 years later. So I think there's an upside

opportunity, but I think we're beginning to see the floor; I don't think we're going to see much of a drop-off.

DR. DIONNE: Anybody else want to take a shot at those questions?

MR. EISNER: Well, I mean, the problems 15 years out is whether the nonprofit sector and government will be able to keep them, whether they'll treat them with the respect and give them the capacity, the resources they need to be effective. It's not that these young people are uninterested in service, but they will not tolerate a 486 computer sitting on their desk for an entire career.

We're under capacity and under-resourced in the nonprofit sector. My research on the federal government suggests that the federal government is not an especially caring employer, not especially good at giving its employees the skills they want; and we tend to chase them out. So, if we want them to stay in public service, we're going to have to create opportunities for them that meet their expectations. And there's this whole growing opportunity for them in social entrepreneurship, which is blended between the sectors, part of these networks that exist, and we ought not to discount the private sector and the blended sector as a destination of choice for these young people as they get older and actually would like to

purchase a car, maybe have a house some place -- you know, that kind of thing.

DR. LIGHT: If I could pick up your second question. As far as the old -- we're seeing the same trend that Paul was just talking about when you start looking at boomers, people looking at their second careers. They're even more focused on needing to be treated well, respectfully, and moving into professional environments; and this is the place where the nonprofit sector really has a lot of work to do to be able to attract folks that are used to working in the business community to now work in the nonprofit, and I think it's basically the government has a lot to do to get these folks moving into the second career as well.

MS.MURGUIA: Yeah, I think the needs are becoming more and more urgent, I think, in terms of wanting to serve a lot of communities out there that -- with just a little bit of help -- can move on; and having the individuals who can fill those roles is really important, but I don't think we can just look to government alone to sort of fill that gap, I think there's other opportunities here.

I just was the Council on Foundation, and it just seems to me that there's other sectors that can take it on themselves to also look out or try to find ways creatively to look for incentives to create not only more leadership and talent, but diversity within that talent; and it seems like

there's not enough creative thinking going on in every sector possible to make than happen, and yet we do know that the numbers show that, again, the baby boomer impact is going to show that we are going to have this deficit when it comes to the nonprofit sector and folks working in this area and leading in this area. And it seems like between the government -- not alone, but other sectors -- might want to create more incentives and perhaps create more advocacy around the need for this; and maybe create more incentive from an advocacy standpoint and advocating for certain types of breaks or credits or something that might allow for that to happen. And we've, I know, explored that on some level with perhaps the **color** stipend; but maybe there's more there that we can do, and I just think it's incumbent on us to be more thoughtful and creative as we see the more urgent needs out there.

DR. DIONNE: I'm going to -- yeah, go ahead.

MS. SPILLETT: You know, this notion of the nonprofit sector being under-resourced; I mean, that's not a new phenomenon for those of who've worked in nonprofits; we know that that exists. But when you think about building the capacity of nonprofits, all these ideas are connected. You know, this idea of strong leadership, the idea of competitive compensation for those like jobs in the community. These are the kinds of things that really require leadership in the nonprofit sector.

Paul, I think one of the things you were referring to, to is the leadership deficit in the nonprofit sector. We may be getting people coming in the pipeline, but developing the leadership of the nonprofit sector -- the kind of people that can lead a nonprofit, generate the resources needed, and have this notion of bringing people and providing training and professional development, of paying competitive wages and competitive benefits -- these are the kinds of things that are going to become increasingly important for the nonprofit sector and its leadership deficit.

DR. DIONNE: Two questions before I turn to the audience. One is, it's always struck me that one of the most -- the fairest skeptical question that skeptics have about AmeriCorps is we know on the whole, and now we have ample evidence, is this is very good for the people who serve.

I'd love one or two of you to address the issue of what this can actually do for the communities that are being served. And then the second question is, should every American do a year of service, should it be compulsory; anybody can take on either or both of those, and then I want to open it up to the audience. Go ahead.

MR. EISNER: Well, I think this is a really key question, and then I'm looking at my chair, who is always telling me that we need better data on what the outcomes and impacts are in the community. And the fact is

that the strength of the program that Congresswoman Shea particularly talked about is also a challenge, because the strength of the program is that it's driven at the local level against the need and the ideas and the sort of identified gaps; and so the AmeriCorps members are doing a myriad of different things. All of these organizations say here's why my program is successful, but it's very hard to roll the data up. We have right now some very powerful anecdotal data; and, just a throw to out, after Katrina -- between then and now -- we've had about 10,000 AmeriCorps members down in the Gulf. Those 10,000 AmeriCorps members have supported between a quarter and a third of America's volunteers in the Gulf. So we've had these 10,000 members making about 300,000 Americans able to serve, help rebuild homes and lives in the Gulf. And when you go down and you watch a person with an AmeriCorps shirt walk into a diner, they get a round of spontaneous applause; and I've seen just on my visits there -- you just watch customers pick up the tab for the AmeriCorps members because down there everybody knows that, absent AmeriCorps, their communities would be missing something critical.

One more example that I really like with Madison, Wisconsin -- six years ago had a gap in third-grade literacy, where African-American students were about six times more likely than white students to fail the third-grade literacy standards.

The University of Wisconsin created an AmeriCorps VISTA program. Fifteen VISTAs every year supervised 700 tutors that went into all the schools in Madison supporting first-, second-, and third-grade reading. This year there's no gap between African-American students and white students; and, we see that instead of 35 percent of African-American third graders failing literacy, we're seeing 97 percent of them succeeding. And, again, that's just leveraged opportunities, 15 AmeriCorps VISTA members supporting 700 community volunteering tutoring in the schools; so that's a strong impact.

MS. SPILLETT: Janet made a point about the sense of urgency around some problems in this country, and I would link that to what David just said; because, if you look at the high-school dropout rate in this country it's hard to believe, yes, on average 70 percent of kids in America graduate from high school. To me that's not good news but that's a fact. If you happen to be a student of color -- Latino, African-American, Native American -- only 50 percent are going to graduate; 50 percent, I mean, think about that. And, if you live in certain cities, only 25 percent of the kids in school are going to graduate. Now, to me, you know, it raises the question, where is the outrage; but, on a more professional level here, I'm thinking, you know, this requires nothing short of a marshal plan, which something people are talking about in different circles here. And I think if

you use David's example of what happens in a town -- in a city, somewhere in America -- and you apply that same energy toward some of the cities like Baltimore, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles, New York, think about the potential impact there. I don't know how America can stay competitive with a dropout rate as we have in this country that's known by very little people, and it's about time we know about it and we do something about it; and I definitely think there's a connect there between AmeriCorps, literacy, education, home work help, tutoring, technology. There's millions of applications there; and, if we don't start using that power in a focused way to solve the problem, I think -- and I'm not saying it's the only solution, but its impact is exceeded by its potential and I think we have to make it come alive in more communities and in more ways, particularly for kids around the dropout problem in America.

DR. DIONNE: (off mike)

MS. MURGUIA: I just think that's the reason why our focus has been largely literacy, because we're seeing that's where we can have the most impact and it's difficult to know how you can evaluate this because I think trying to see exactly when even schools have a hard time keeping statistics on this, and there's different approaches to how you keep up with the dropout rates; but it is true, we are seeing significant challenges there. But I think you do want to focus on having maybe some good evaluation

criteria; because, at the end of the day, you can see the impact based on the individuals that you're tracking in your particular area. And I think the testimonials that we get when folks have been involved with one of our tutors or mentors and have seen that sort of relationship develop, it has a very positive impact; and, it's hard to quantify it sometimes because, beyond the graduation rate, you're hoping that that connection will allow them to understand that they can have an opportunity to interact with someone who's giving them more to think about, who's telling them that they have a lot more to offer and to continue to succeed. So, for us, I think there's no question that focusing on literacy and having the mentoring and tutoring is the key reason why we want to make sure that we can bring some area of focus to this, because it is real easy to get spread out and have a lot of folks do a lot of different things which, as Chris Roche said, that's the marvel of this program; but we have tried to focus on where we believe are the more urgent needs, and that's certainly education around literacy. And we've seen, I think, some tremendous impact occur there in different communities.

DR. LIGHT: Well, I think that Boys & Girls Clubs, which are terrific organizations, your annual meeting is coming up. It's a great, great meeting. We always struggle with this issue.

Teach for America has been struggling with control group design to really see whether or not the Teach for America corps members make a difference in the classroom, and it's very rigorous research; they're really putting it on the line and challenging themselves to prove that one year of teaching is going to make a difference in verbal and math scores, and AmeriCorps is going to have to get there.

We see the impact on the individual member of AmeriCorps, and it is awe-inspiring at some level; but we need to see what the intervention effect in a similar control group design, where you've an AmeriCorps member doing one thing and side by side is somebody else. And I'm sure you're just delighted at the potential research.

MR. EISNER: Well, part -- so, for example, Teach for America --

MR. LIGHT: Next million-dollar study, yeah.

MR. EISNER: Teach for America is an AmeriCorps program.

MR. LIGHT: Yeah.

MR. EISNER: We're trying to figure out --

MR. LIGHT: Well, that's true but --

MR. EISNER: -- Teach for America's impact and the city year's impact and the youth confirmation course, and figuring out how to jam it all together into one set of results is very hard.

MR. LIGHT: Yeah, interesting.

DR. DIONNE: Now, we're going to have some mics around the audience. The one request I would make is, to paraphrase the political side is Madonna's "Papa and Mamma Don't Preach," is the subject of which we all like to preach; but if you can more concise, the more focused we can get in. Please, sir, right behind you; he was the very first hand I saw.

MR. JONES: I'm Tom Jones with Habitat for Humanity International; and (1) I really thank all of you for the kind of leadership and it meant to all of us through the years, and certainly this confirms the anecdote that all of us have had through the years.

I'd like to get to David's question, though, how do we use the data. This is really important data; and, believe it or not, I'm still raising a 15-year-old, so I'm involved in middle school and that sort of thing. It seems to me that we need to use this data in a way that will impact those who may be younger than we have before and parents of those and teachers of those. It seems that if we marketed this in a right way that we could really do career day stuff, and we could PTA stuff, and we could do teachers' union and counselors and the like. And if we get the parents, I think that's also going to lead the way to the baby boomers as people begin to think again about the need that all of us have to serve society; because, really, the secret to life is -- well, I'm preaching here but -- it's

best to give rather than to get. But, anyway, I hope we can really work hard on how to use the data. It really is important and significant that we now have the research and not just the anecdotes that all of us have been telling.

DR. DIONNE: Thank you, I love that. The spirit of this building has infected everyone; it's a classic Brookings question, how do you use the data. Anybody want to take that on.

MR. EISNER: Well, we did a Brookings briefing so now we need to figure out our next step.

DR. DIONNE: Any thoughts on how this data -- well, thank you for your thoughts. There was one -- right behind you. I'm sorry, I'm sending you back and then we'll go forward -- right there?

MS. FOX: My thanks, also. I'm Elizabeth Fox from Experience Corps and Civic Ventures, which is a great panel, and I would -- both gentlemen referred to older members of AmeriCorps and National Service and so on. And I would love to know from the two nonprofit leaders how you would see the positive and/or negative impact of bringing in significantly more older AmeriCorps and other National Service members for the purpose not only of expanding the services, but also of moving more people into the public service job pipeline that Paul has talked about.

MS. SPILLETT: I think there's real potential there, you know, particularly with encore careers, people who are retired that may have skills in finance, that may have skills in marketing, that may have skills in HR, that there are many different ways that they can strengthen local nonprofit; so I think the great upside there, in addition to volunteering with kids in programs, I think there's a huge upside to early retirees who want to explore another career either as a volunteer or a significantly reduced salary where they can contribute some real skill, particularly in those areas of finance, HR, marketing. I mean, those are huge for nonprofit; and, again, coming back to this notion of nonprofits being under-resourced. Not every nonprofit can afford a CFO.

MS. MURGUIA: I would just agree. I reiterate a lot of what Roxanne said and I think there is a growing need; and I think, as we see some folks wanting to retire but not completely sort of get out of some service, they're looking for opportunities to volunteer and this would be welcome opportunity. And I think if we could find ways to integrate some of these folks into the nonprofits, I think they could be a valuable service; and I think the need is there and they're going to be a good match -- it's a win-win.

DR. DIONNE: This gentleman here has had his hand up for almost from the beginning.

MR. CULBERTSON: Hi, I'm Steve Culbertson from Youth Service America. We know that half the world's population is now under 25; 40 percent is under 19. And we know that you can't pull the switch when someone turns 18 and expect them to be civically engaged.

How do we bring some of these resources down to younger children. Imagine that this is the results that David's getting from the 18-24. Imagine if we'd started them at five. How do we move some of these resources so that children are actually experiencing not being served but serving?

MS. SPILLETT: I'll be glad to take -- you know my feelings on this already. I think service is something that should be part of not just an education but part of community life, and it should start with very young children. And that it becomes not just an activity or not a year of dedication, but it's a way of life. And I think it's particularly important for young kids for three reasons.

One is that it is good for them. They have benefits like increased school performance, better school performance, better leadership, greater self-confidence, the kinds of things young people themselves need to succeed they get from meaningful service opportunities. That's point number one.

Point number two, our kids -- and we've got to believe in them -- can provide a meaningful service in their communities. They're a real asset, they needed to be treated that way, and they can provide a real benefit.

And, thirdly, our American democracy requires us to raise our children to understand that this life here on earth is not measured so much in what you get, but what you give. So I think the huge issue is making sure we conserve our American democracy for the long term. We've got to start early and we're committed to that.

DR. DIONNE: And I would say to Steve, I think your point is dead on; we're talking about a pipeline here. This study is about the sort of pivotal moment in the pipeline. The question you're asking is, how do we get more people into the pipeline? I think we're seeing this through Youth Service; Service Learning are really powerful, drivers are doing that. We have AmeriCorps alums here. Will the AmeriCorps alums stand? So will all of you who started serving before AmeriCorps stay standing -- started serving before AmeriCorps stay standing. So you see that this pipeline doesn't start with AmeriCorps; this pipeline starts way ahead.

I would just note one note of optimism. Other research that we've done with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the fact that they're showing on this millennial generation that you were talking about earlier. We're

looking at 16 to 19-year-olds today volunteering 100 percent more than 16 to 19-year-olds did in the 70s, 80s and 90s; and so we really have such an opportunity to make this pipeline strong, but it's going to take driving Youth Service and driving Service Learning into the lower ages.

MS. SPILLETT: Which is exactly what you do.

MS. MURGUIA: On the young people point, the exposure that their parents give them to service is another avenue; and, I tell you, we've benefited at NCLR. There's at least a handful of folks who work for me now as staff who went with their parents to the meetings, or whose parents worked maybe in one of our CDOs; and it was just understood that those little kids were going to file and collate, and they remember growing up and they said they didn't know anything else. So the exposure that parents can provide to their children at a young age -- that example that they set -- goes to what Roxanne's talking about. But if you're able to live that example as well as to say that it's important to serve -- and show that and demonstrate that -- we'll, there's nothing more valuable and, I think, more of a connector for kids than to actually see their parents live that; and that's the first initial exposure that they can have in a positive way.

DR. DIONNE: That gentleman, the veteran right there -- please.

MR. MARCUS: Hi, my name is Aaron Marcus; I'm an AmeriCorps alum with service out of Oregon. I'm also a student of EJ's at Georgetown.

DR. DIONNE: That was biased on my part, but she was right there.

MR. MARCUS: My question is for Mr. Eisner. I know that this study has surveyed 2000 full-time AmeriCorps members; I wonder if you can offer any insight on the part-time AmeriCorps members and if you see -- I also know that out of the 75,000 AmeriCorps members, the part-time members are growing. So, in the future, do you see the full-time or the part-time members growing in one direction or another.

MR. EISNER: An excellent question from a public policy student, so thank you. We are working to add a part-time cohort; we'll probably be starting a new cohort within the next year or two so that we can be building more longitudinal data. At the time we did this in the year 1999 to the end of 2000, we were really just beginning to understanding the part-time space and we didn't have much stability there; so it wasn't baked in as part of the study.

I think that we will find that the level of intensity does contribute to the strength of the outcome, and so on of the things we're going to try and figure out is where's the break point. How much intensity do you need so that you actually start seeing these long-term outcomes.

DR. DIONNE: Right here. Not a student of mine.

MS. TRIPP: Hi, my name is Amity Tripp; I'm the Executive Director of AmeriCorps Alums, and I'm an AmeriCorps Alum myself. And this really hits home. The study is so exciting because we see alums every day that are leaders in the community and are actually doing this; so, to see it on paper, it's like, ah, you know, we knew this happened but now we really can prove it. So what AmeriCorps Alums hopes to do with these findings is really foster the talent as you think, to staff the nonprofits with these excellent employees and to really empower these AmeriCorps Alums that our civic leader type to actually be in existence that way. And we have a good employer center online where we can match an AmeriCorps member with a job opening. But what we find, and what the challenge is, finding and connecting with these AmeriCorps Alums. They often send us their year and go off into their lives. And a lot of them find their own opportunities, but I think that our challenge is that a lot of them just need that leg up; you know, they just need to be connected with opportunities to find, to volunteer opportunities. Just a lot of times when they leave their service year it's just hard to connect to those. And so what I ask of you is with NCLR having 1,500 a year with the Boys & Girls Clubs having, you said, 800 to 1,000 alumni each year, how can we access those young people in those numbers so they can be connected to

AmeriCorps Alums and we can help give them those resources. How can you help us, I guess, connect with them and find them each year?

DR. DIONNE: Can I ask – bring Paul into this?

MR. EISNER: Uh-hum.

DR. DIONNE: Did you say something?

DR LIGHT: Well, I mean, part of the problem with the nonprofit sector is that we don't have a very strong national infrastructure. Our trade associations are weak, they tend to focus on, you know, very specific issues and you're going to have to build it. I you want to build a matching service like Civic Ventures is working on, or Bridge Span or Bridge Star, I guess, you know, take it on yourself. You're a social entrepreneur, you know; create it. You've got Idealist.org, you've got other organizations that are going matching; but, if you want to work with AmeriCorps volunteers, seek them out, provide some capacity building for them, leadership development, perhaps. I just know a lot of funders who would invest and them match them, you know; so become a social entrepreneur and do it.

DR. DIONNE: You just said the magic word, and Amity is going to be following up with you, I think.

MR. LIGHT: Yeah.

MS. TRIPP: I think the building and capacity is a big part, because a lot of them are -- they want to do the service and they're the leader type. A lot of them just need a little more training, and really that training piece is really what we want to provide; and then the matching is next. So, yeah, I'll definitely follow up with you.

DR. DIONNE: And we have to, like, emphasize that T-shirt thing in getting a free lunch. So you AmeriCorps volunteers or members should go to the Brookings cafeteria and see if you can get a free lunch; see if you can get a free lunch as part of your service. Now, the other question is whether you want that free lunch; that's your own challenge.

DR LIGHT: Thank you for comparing.

DR. DIONNE: It's not bad. The lady at the back, please.

MS. ALVARADO: Yeah, right here. Audrey Alvarado with the National Council of Nonprofit Associations when the weak trade associations fall.

A couple of things. One is that one of the challenges for young folks to move into the nonprofit sector and compensation was mentioned is the low pay. There was a bill that was passed last year, the College Cost Reduction and Access Act, which was to encourage folks to go into the public sector; and we battled to make sure that they included nonprofits. They did include nonprofits but a very limited number,

depending on the kind of work they're doing; so we're still trying to encourage them to broaden that, but I think that's going to help. A loan forgiven after 10 years, certainly, with some restrictions.

The question I have for the panel -- and it was a question that E.J. may have asked you -- is would any of you be willing to go on record saying that we would mandatorily require every high school student to provide one year of service, maybe a gap year?

DR. DIONNE: Thank you. I was going to come back to it, but thank you for noticing that no one took that particular question on. Go ahead, David.

MR. EISNER: So I think that the issue is not -- the issue is how you would execute a plan like that. What we've seen is when service is mandated, the mandate doesn't mean that you have a strong outcome. The question is how is the service performed, how professional is it, and we've seen mandated service actually turn students off and have the negative impact.

The other challenge for me is I run the corporation and I see the magic of AmeriCorps and senior core learning service. What happens is this incredible chemistry where someone who is dedicated to making a difference comes up against an intractable problem and overcomes it, and it happens and over and over and over again in our communities because

of sort of this power of service. When I want to give of myself to change something, I can make that change happen against all odds. And the question is what happens to that chemistry when the people don't want to be there. How are you -- are you really going to have this same amazing set of outcome when the youth that are serving against these obstacles or actually there reluctantly. So I think this question -- I would love to see more Americans have the sense of expectation that, as Allen Casey said, it becomes -- the question that they ask is, not where did you go to Europe, but where did you do your year of service. I just don't know if the way to get there is through mandate.

DR. DIONNE: Anybody else on this question?

MS. SPILLETT: Go ahead, Paul.

DR. LIGHT: Well, you end up -- and we've debated this a fair amount -- in my class with students, and I'm at NYU now, so I continue to bounce around.

SPEAKER: Good deed there, right?

DR. LIGHT: No, thank God. My students debate the deferment issue, because what would happen with National Service is that we'd have to really commit to everyone or start with the deferment that we've seen work their will. That's what my students are more concerned about. They like the idea of National Service, but they start to say, well, would Dick

Cheney be in there. And what would happen to this person or that person. Would it end up being kind of, really, the AmeriCorps model on a larger scale with more people choosing in but other people opting out. And so we see that same problem with execution, even though it's a very appealing idea.

DR. DIONNE: Anyone else?

MS. SPILLETT: I would just say that in my mind I think there's a higher goal that I would aspire to, and that is to lift the next generation to a level of civic engagement not seen since the founding of our nation.

Now, I don't believe in my heart of hearts that compulsory service is the way to get there. I believe the way to get there is to make this part of who we are as Americans have parents create that expectation of kids, have schools create that expectation of their kids, have nonprofits -- like Boys & Girls Clubs and other youth-serving organizations -- which I think do a pretty good job, but to ratchet that up so that it doesn't become, you've go to do this. It becomes kind of, the gift you give to America. And I think we can create that if we get kind of the groundswell of support, you know, these organizations working on that every day. But I think that's the higher goal that I would aspire to. And I'm not sure -- and, Audrey, I've not studied this, so I'm no scholar. It's my intuitive sense that we need to lift a

generation and the generation after that, and maybe compulsory service is not the best way to do that.

MS. MURGUIA: I think I would agree with you, I said. I would just add, though, that in addition to the higher expectations, I do believe that the compensation and financial incentives and scholarships and stipends have to be ramped in with that; it just can't be the expectation factor alone. It needs to be ramped-up efforts on all of these other financial incentives that can be a part of it, and I think that combination -- I think -- can hopefully meet those needs short of the mandatory requirement, because I would agree with David that I think once you start to mandate this, there is something that sort of you lose in all of that; and you want to keep that sort of aspirational piece to this that, I think, makes it a very special experience.

DR. DIONNE: One last question. I just want to get a 30-second answer to the question I asked everybody, which is I don't think we're going to get to the compulsory service any time soon. I'd like to see a big enough package of benefits, particularly job education or job preparation or training to make service more attractive and also to find another way to solve the affordability problem in higher education. I think we could have massively -- it could become much more of an expectation if we would do

service and linked it to a decent size, a kind of GI bill set of benefits; but if that's said -- so we'd have to debate the cost of that. Last question.

MR. CAPRARA: David Caprara, I'm here at Brookings, the Director of the Initiative on International Volunteering & Service. I wanted to give a plug for an upcoming event, but also to thank David. When I was at the corporation after directing VISTA, CFC has supported a project that lead to this project here at Brookings, sort of an international roundtable on volunteering and service. Diane Melley from IBM chairs a global corporate volunteering task force, and I think there's over 150 NGOs, universities lead by AmeriCorps here with the Building Bridges Coalition.

President Clinton, in January in an event with Martin Luther King, III, commented on the interest of AmeriCorps and SouthAfriCorps that he helped bring it to and currently on the West Bank; and so I think that momentum is very exciting, and thank you, David, for saying connect the dots.

I also want to acknowledge just an upcoming event. Shirley Segau is here, on of the foundational players. Sally Pratt and I -- and I think a few others in the room -- are on the planning committee for what's called the Service Nation Summit in September, indeed will link this robust vision of National Service at home and abroad. There's Omnibus legislation being crafted. I can't mention the sponsors yet, but our colleague, John

Brisnow and Alan Casey, sitting here, et al., Harris Wolford, kind of the Who's Who and I cordially encourage everyone here to be part of this time-hosted summit that Caroline Kennedy and Alma Powell will co-chair from this foundation today to the fall – to really set the table, I think, and educate the platform for the coming Administration. So thank you and hats off to David and E.J. today.

DR. DIONNE: Thank you. We've got Steve Goldsmith who's going to close this. I just want to close with two comments and a thank you.

The first comment is, I was really struck by David's defining that people who do service are more satisfied in their lives, and I can see a poster now -- Don't Worry, Be Happy, Do Service. And if you look at the cases of all of the AmeriCorps volunteers who stood up, that it's clearly Annie Bell Lebanon, so what a perfect name for a former AmeriCorps volunteer than Amity.

The second part I want to make is -- is it a party? A friend of mine and favorite political philosopher, is called Mike Sandell and he ended the book with the following phrase. He said, "when policy fairs well, we can know a good and common that we can not know alone"; and I think that can be rendered in terms of today's events. When service goes well, we can know a good and common that we can not know alone.

I want to thank our panelists for working in common today on this great cause. Thank you so much.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Thank you, E.J.

DR. DIONNE: And we go out and introduce Steve Goldsmith. I was thinking of it. I was going to say, Steve is one of my favorite republicans, but those who know me say, well, that's not saying much from you, although the truth is I love a lot of republicans. I agree with a few of them, but Steve endured an extraordinary and vigorous and innovative public service. Back when he was mayor of Indianapolis, everybody thought he was really strange because you go on this thing called email and allow citizens to communicate with him as mayor; and, suddenly, people discovered that Steve Goldsmith, on this and on so many other things was way ahead of the curve among public officials.

He is the Daniel Hall Professor of Government at Harvard University's Kennedy School. He's the author of several books, most recently, "Governing by Network." He's still exploring this question. "Government by Network" is the phrase of the public sector. He's written for "The Wall Street Journal" and the "New York Times." As I said, he was two terms as mayor of Indianapolis. He served as Special Advisor to the President on faith-based and not-for-profit initiatives. He's currently Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for National and Community

Service, and he's an all-around great human being. It's great to have you, Steve Goldsmith.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Thank you, E.J. I appreciate our friendship despite the fact that you've tarnished my reputation as a republican by saying nice things about me. E.J. came out and inspected some of the things we did in Indianapolis. I appreciate the Brookings sponsorship and David's report on this important presentation.

We did, at the earlier part of the session, have a couple board members and former board members, meaning major and the vice chair, Vince Swaresi, was here as well. So thanks for being here, as well as David's leadership team, in addition.

You've heard about this report and you have this illustrious panel and you have these congressional speakers, and so I'm kind of the clean-up hitter and let me just make a couple general comments; and, instead of being repetitive because we have a lot of folks in the room who devote their profession and their lives to service and others who devote their lives to studying those who are about to involve in service -- David, you did ask at the beginning, who could remember an event, what was it, eight years later would have significance in their lives. Well, I'm 7-1/2 years into my chairmanship at AmeriCorps and it's nice to have a report released to say that what we're doing is worthwhile.

Let me think, if you can, hence the title of the conference is the future of AmeriCorps; and let me think just a little more broadly than just the discussion we've had today. I mean, we're all aware that there are different views of the definition of service. E.J. provoked some of those in his questioning. And 7-1/2 years ago, there were very strident and divergent congressional views on the future of AmeriCorps as well. And it's been our goal over the last almost eight years to weave together those themes into a larger umbrella that involves and invigorates service irrespective of an individual's definition of what that should look like. And, you know, we began with some folks believe that service is inherently a kind of a detote villain event that doesn't involve the federal government and should not involve the federal government, and that's a respectful and important view that can exist regardless of what we do with the size or the scope of the AmeriCorps program. There are others that I have suggested by a couple of the questions to believe that every American should serve a year, at least, of service; and many agree with that, although not so many agree that it should be compulsory, that's a stream as well.

And then there is a kind of third stream of thought that supports our work, and I think we'll support the expansion of it, which is that what AmeriCorps represents and service represents is the infrastructure of

community service, not community service in and of itself but the rationale for the investment by the federal government and the terrific work by the individuals who are here who are Alums, is that it serves as the infrastructure to support volunteerism over a broader base. And that broader base, I think, brings together the left and the right into agreement. They may not agree with what it is, you know, left may not like what some individuals on the right are doing with their definition of service and vice versa; but, by a broad commitment that civic service itself -- civic participation itself -- is a value in this democracy, we can build together a broader array of support which will -- if you think about AmeriCorps in the future -- should produce those results.

I'm proud of the fact that AmeriCorps has expanded its reach into the faith-based communities and into minority communities as well, and I think that speaks strongly for this effort to build a consensus round our common agenda.

And then I think if you add today's report, you've got a fourth theme, if you will, for the service movement, which is a recruiting network for those who will be influential in their communities and politics in the future. I was particularly struck by a part of the report that suggests that if young adults from disadvantaged communities have AmeriCorps opportunities, they are much more likely to participate in the future -- that

the difference for them is even more pronounced than the difference for middle-class kids. And so we have a fourth theme which is very important to democracy itself, which is a broader and more diverse array of individuals in leadership positions in their communities and politics. So that feels to me like that's the framework for a broad consensus, and we have fought for the seven-plus years to avoid this discussion of whether a particular individual service -- as he or she defines it -- is something that we want to have a referendum about, right? There's a whole purpose of civic participation as to encourage individuals to serve as they see fit; and, I think, based upon that, we've seen some improvements, right?

As you've heard in the earlier panel, and many of us see the issues today, it's not whether AmeriCorps will survive; the issue is how much it will be expanded. And there are many who feel that that definition of expansion is too small or too marginal, but it's a lot better discussion to be asked and should it survive at all; and there's been substantial change in that regard as well.

The institution of the Corporation for National and Community Service under David's leadership, and the others who are here, is sounder than it was before. It's less open to kind of, got your politics, an effort to find a managerial mistake which affects the mission of the organization

and the mission of the organization's management is solid; and I think that provides support as well.

And then, as we all know, all three of the remaining presidential candidates are broadly supportive of expansions of the AmeriCorps program, a remarkably different set of dialogues and discussions. In fact, I don't know, I haven't done an inventory of all three of their positions; so this may be the only thing that all three of them agree on, right, that there ought to be a major expansion of AmeriCorps. So that feels good as well.

Now, if you say, okay, well, what is the future? We've got a little more political capacity, a little more political will, we've got more managerial capacity, and we have more intensity about the expansion. We have a rationale that a lot of folks have bought into about why this sort of activity is strong and good, and now where do we go from there.

First, as many of the last panelists referenced, necessity should drive folks to service in AmeriCorps. The scope and complexity of the social problems that E.J. and others write about are very deep in our society -- disparity of opportunity, in particular, for many young adults in our communities, the horrible high school dropout rates and the like we've talked about, the wealth gap; the complexity of those problems is too great for governmental loan, right? Even if government were to dramatically

increase its grant of just dollars, right, it can't resolve the complexities of those problems in the way it delivers the dollars.

We also know that there's a lot to be said for kind of individual capacity and individual opportunity, but there are folks in many of our communities who just don't have the foundation and the support to allow their individual capacities to flourish. So that feels to me like if you say in the next 10, 20, and 30 years, the only way for the country to continue to prosper is for collective action, right? Collective action is when an individual participates in solving his or her own problem. That individual has the support from a caring adult or a peer who is involved in their life. The government recognizes its obligations to support the delivery of services through that mechanism of collective action, is the only way -- whether you're talking about baby boomer volunteers or high school volunteers or AmeriCorps volunteers or community volunteers -- is the co-production of those services is the only way we're going to move forward, a meaningful adult in the life of another adult or a child as well.

So we have an imperative for AmeriCorps' essence, right, that derives from the demand for social action itself. We have, really, an opportunity, I think, to build on this theory of AmeriCorps as the infrastructure for volunteerism. David commented the report reflects that one of the valuable activities of AmeriCorps is training and recruiting

volunteers is producing a cadre that's training and volunteer management. If you look at the not-so-rosy numbers from the corporation as to community service, the reason that there's been just a little bit of -- you know, we had this ramp up of volunteerism, about 65 million, and then we had this little bit of a dip and a leveling off; and the dip became, as many of you know or all of you know, because volunteers were dropping out, and they're dropping out because they're not managed thoroughly and comprehensively enough by a cadre of trained individuals who give them meaningful experiences. And the reason that Americans, young and old, participate in these volunteer activities is because they want to have an opportunity to make a difference in the life of a child or a family or a community or a country. And so an inherent reason for the growth of AmeriCorps, right, is to say that foundation -- that cadre of trained volunteers -- that allows others to serve in a meaningful way is indispensable. And I think we see from that dip -- from 65 million to about 61 and half million, more or less -- that that dip occurred because of the dropout rate. The dropout rate occurred because of a lack of capacity, and that this is a program -- as we look forward -- that can make a very meaningful difference.

Now, in addition to kind of -- all of that, I think, kind of good news for the movement. The problem is, you know, I just don't anticipate

enormous amounts of new money allocated to the AmeriCorps program. You know, maybe we'll get a couple of the presidential candidates to set \$200,000, \$250,000, or \$75,000 up from \$50,000 -- actually, it's \$75,000 up from \$25,000, anywhere you put that unfortunate benchmark. But still it doesn't feel like we're going to get high enough; and I think the discussions for increasing AmeriCorps is an important one.

I would say, though, that those of us who are committed to the AmeriCorps movement may not want to have exclusively the answer to. The federal government's participation of service is driven just through that window. I've been working for a little while here with the help of others, the Corporation for National and Community Service and others in the White House just to ask the question, "why is the conversation about service driven through AmeriCorps only?" Why isn't every government grant program that's applicable require as part of its criteria for judging in its peer review that it demonstrates its utilization of volunteers and service, right? Why can't we drive it? AmeriCorps is a -- CNCS is a billion-dollar program, which sounds like a lot of money; it is, but it's not a lot of money compared to the rest of the government. And, if you just have to touch a few of the remaining programs to provide meaningful opportunities for others to serve the country; and I think we should ask that and demand

that and expand the footprint as well as it should be at the state and local level.

And then I think lastly, and probably more just to provoke thought -- I don't want the next comment to be a proposal because it will get me in trouble. But I think we need to ask the question of the connection between the educational stipend and AmeriCorps and service, and what's the stipend budget, \$350 million a year or?

SPEAKER: \$225.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Okay, so it's \$200-300 million a year. And one of the folks in the audience asked the question or complimented the change that allows the higher education financing to allow your student debt to go away after 10 years if you're involved in volunteerism.

I would ask the question this way.

A. Why is it cliff vesting, to use the stock term, why is it you've got to get to 10 years before you have any benefit.

B. If we really want to intent service, perhaps we should tie it, as E.J. referenced, to higher education forgiveness throughout the period and re-deploy the \$200-300 million that's in the AmeriCorps budget to more positions and have a valuable educational award that's funded out of education that's tied to service; because our research is not that robust that students find that a \$40-600/\$4,800 stipend that's taxable 10 years

later applied against their \$50,000 of student debt is necessarily a meaningful amount. And so we ought to make it. My suggestion is we not make it meaningless, we make it meaningful; we make it meaningful by tying it more broadly to higher education funding, and we take the resources that are available and we dramatically expand the AmeriCorps program, thus allowing even more adults, young adults, and senior retirees to volunteer. So if you step back, I think what we have today is proof that the AmeriCorps experience benefits over a long period of time those who serve.

I would say that we can spend a lot of time on research proposals, but I think we'd be better off to postulate that civic participation is good for America; and that the more folks who serve, the better, and the more that each one of them serves, the better, and that we need to build out the infrastructure for service and that building out that infrastructure of service is really the only way the country is going to provide very significant opportunities for a lot of young adults, in particular, who won't have the chance for their talents to flourish but will with the meaningful participation of a volunteer.

Thank you very much for your good work.

DR. DIONNE: Thank you all.

\* \* \* \* \*