Hi Susan,
As always,
I benefit from
your ideas and
help. All best - Jeff

I have
tried to
highlight
your many
contributions!

THE PERILS OF PRACTICE:

REACHING THE SUMMIT

Jeffrey L. Brudney
University of Georgia
Department of Political Science
104 Baldwin Hall
Athens, GA 30602 - 1615

(706) 542 - 2057 (Voice)
(706) 542 - 4421 (Fax)
JBRUDNEY@ARCHES.UGA.EDU (E-mail)

IN PRESS, NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Conference, "Volunteering: The Way Forward," at the Down Lisburn Trust, Laganview Conference Center, Northern Ireland, June 4, 1997. The author thanks the Editor and anonymous reviewers of Nonprofit Management and Leadership for their excellent comments and suggestions.

THE PERILS OF PRACTICE:

REACHING THE SUMMIT

Abstract

On April 27 - 29, 1997, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, hosted the first-ever "Presidents' Summit for America's Future," an historic meeting that brought unprecedented attention to volunteerism in service to the nation's young people. Based on the experience and careful analysis of a Summit delegate, this article concludes that while the spotlight afforded volunteerism was helpful, the hard work to be done by the local delegations to accomplish the Summit agenda will likely not be successful as organizers hope due to limitations in follow-up mechanisms and in the capacity and expertise of nonprofit organizations to integrate and manage volunteers effectively.

THE PERILS OF PRACTICE:

REACHING THE SUMMIT

One of the happiest days of my professional life occurred in February, 1997, when I was asked to represent my city as a member of its delegation to the Presidents' Summit for America's Future. In addition to the honor of representing my home, I was gratified because the Summit was a "must attend" event for anyone with a serious interest in volunteerism. The chance to work with delegates from 140 localities and all 50 states, representatives from the nonprofit community, major donors from the corporate sector, and scores of elected leaders (more than 40 governors and 100 mayors) to increase volunteer and philanthropic activity was irresistible. Since the announcement of the Presidents' Summit, I had tried to finagle an invitation, for it promised to be the largest event ever staged in behalf of volunteerism.

The Summit did not disappoint: It offered gala entertainment, the spectacle of four Presidents sharing the same stage (and Mrs. Reagan standing in for her husband), and speeches by other dignitaries, all extolling volunteerism in behalf of the nation's youth. Behind the scenes, local delegations worked in arduous group sessions led by trained facilitators to hammer out operational plans for realizing the goals of the Summit back home. I made it a point to talk with as many other delegates and attendees as possible. Over the course of the three-day meeting, held in Philadelphia, April 27-29, 1997, all of these conversations revealed high levels of optimism and commitment to the Summit agenda of increasing dramatically the amount of volunteering and involvement in the lives of young people, an experience typical of many other delegates (for example, Seita, 1997, p. 4).

The only questioning voices I heard in Philadelphia came not from other delegates but from the legions of reporters covering the event eager for a new slant or fresh angle on the Summit meeting and its implications. The media asked some penetrating questions: What had the Presidents' Summit for America's Future accomplished? What were the main limitations of the Summit? What would happen after the grand event? From the vantage point of the past two years, we can begin to answer these questions, although the recency of the Summit and the formation of its successor, America's Promise: The Alliance for Youth, preclude definitive assessment. Nevertheless, a certain urgency surrounds these issues, for the Summit organizers set for themselves a deadline of the year 2,000 for achieving its goals. Although America's Promise officials leave open the possibility that the organization may not sunset as originally intended, it seems more than appropriate to inquire into the progress and legacy of the Presidents' Summit for America's Future.

Accomplishments of the Presidents' Summit

With the possible exception of such dramatic exigencies as world war or state funerals, the Presidents' Summit marshaled one of the largest aggregations ever of U.S. political clout and bipartisan unity -- all assembled to promote volunteerism in service to the nation's youth. According to presidential historian Michael Beschloss, the Summit was "probably the most substantive gathering of ex-presidents in recent history" (Shepard, 1997, p. A4). The signature to the event was the sharing of the same Philadelphia stage by all living Presidents, Bill Clinton, George Bush, Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford, and Nancy Reagan (representing former President Ronald Reagan), to show their support for volunteerism. Countless U.S. Senators,

Congresspersons, governors, mayors, city councilpersons, and other elected and appointed officials also attended, but their light was dimmed considerably by the appearance of the Presidents and the leadership of General Colin L. Powell (ret.), Summit Chairperson, soon to be named Chairman of the follow-on organization to the Summit, America's Promise.

Former political rivals Presidents Clinton and Bush underscored the bipartisan nature of the event. At a White House press conference announcing the Summit (January 24, 1997), President Clinton declared, "citizen service belongs to no party, no ideology. It is an American idea which every American should embrace." President Bush echoed "that the fact that presidents of very different political views and experiences ... are coming together to back this wonderful movement will send a signal that this is more than politics" (1997, p. 32). If as Robert Goodwin, CEO of the Points of Light Foundation and America's Promise board member, maintains, "The idea of having a presidential summit was to raise the vision of volunteering as a strategy to solve the serious social problems of the country and to depoliticize the service arena," it succeeded admirably (Havemann, 1998; Batchilder and Clolery, 1998b).

The Summit brought unprecedented attention to the need to contribute time to help children considered at-risk. The focus on a specific target for volunteering rather than volunteering in general was a distinctive feature of the event, for exhortations to volunteer for public or other purposes are commonplace in the United States. They are issued regularly at every level of government, starting with the President and encompassing state governors and legislators, city councils and mayors, county commissions and executives, school boards and principals. As Susan Chambre' (1989) correctly observes, expansion of the number and types of people who do volunteer work and the range of their philanthropic activities has been public

policy in the U.S. for nearly the past forty years. And while few government agencies or nonprofit organizations can boast waiting lists of eager volunteers, for the most part, these calls seemed to have worked. In the United States, much of the public's business -- services embracing a gamut of services from ambulance to zoos -- depends on the able and generous assistance of volunteers (Brudney, 1990).

In addition to unifying political officialdom (at least for the moment) around issues of volunteerism, the Summit succeeded in coalescing significant segments of the corporate and nonprofit communities. It concentrated volunteer and philanthropic energy from all sectors -- public, nonprofit, and business -- on the very real problems confronting the nation's at-risk youth. The Summit promulgated an agenda to provide young people with access to five fundamental resources:

- An ongoing relationship with a caring adult mentor, tutor or coach;
- Safe places and structured activities during non-school hours to learn and grow;
- A healthy start;
- A marketable skill through effective education; and
- An opportunity to "give back" through community service

The goal is to provide two million at-risk children with all five resources and another five million with help in at least one of these areas by the year 2,000.

The organizers of the Presidents' Summit adopted a companion strategy that added further to the distinctiveness of the event. Prior to the Philadelphia meeting, General Powell scoured the corporate and nonprofit landscape for organizations willing to make a definite commitment of volunteers, equipment, resources, facilities, and/or funding to the five-goal

agenda. By all accounts, he was remarkably successful, securing pledges of more than $750 million in cash and in-kind donations from companies, charities, and individuals (Hall and Wallace, 1997, p. 32). In the process, Powell gained notoriety for applying a "sweat test" to corporate executives to "notch-up" their generosity to a higher level than they had originally thought possible (Boldt, 1997, p. R1). America's Promise has continued this effort with equal intensity (see Dundjerski and Hall, 1998), so that in the first year report to the nation General Powell was able to announce more than 350 corporate and nonprofit pledges and volunteer commitments to the Summit agenda -- so many that his organization could not put a precise estimate on their dollar value (Batchilder and Clolery, 1998a, p. 4).

With respect to raising the profile of volunteerism as a strategy to help young people and mobilizing many in the government, business, and nonprofit sectors behind this initiative, the Presidents' Summit for America's Future can claim notable successes. But the Summit also had limitations, which merit careful attention.

Limitations of the Summit

Given the insistence of Summit organizers on summoning ever greater numbers of volunteers to is service agenda, the most immediate question is how well the Philadelphia meeting has achieved this purpose. To place the issue in perspective, despite the sharp profile given to volunteerism by recent U.S. Presidents, even that great office (together with many lesser ones) has not been able to stir the public to increasing rates of donating their time -- and as illustrated by the discussion above, those calls enjoyed the advantage of repetition. Biennial national surveys conducted by the Gallup Organization for Independent Sector show that the rate of volunteering

by American adults has remained remarkably stable since the mid 1980s when the surveys began. Throughout the series, about one-half of the U.S. adult population state that they have "volunteered" during the past twelve months, defined in the surveys as "actually working in some way to help others for no monetary pay." As scholars in the field are no doubt aware, this figure is enormous, in 1995 amounting to 93 million Americans donating an average of just over four hours of time per week (20.3 billion hours of service in all), the equivalent of 9.2 million full-time employees with a dollar value estimated at more than $200 billion (Hodgkinson, et al., 1996). While these statistics demonstrate the admirable generosity of the American people, since the 1980s they have not responded much to the exhortations of political leaders or other influences to do even more.

With these data as backdrop, it should not be surprising to learn that the Presidents' Summit has apparently not fared so well in mobilizing new volunteers -- albeit a very tall order, especially in so short a time. Because academic research has not addressed this issue, evidence must be culled from other sources. Articles published in major news outlets (for example, the New York Times and the Washington Post) marking the six-month and one-year anniversaries of the Summit report no new influx of volunteers across the country in response to the event (Havemann, 1998; Miller, 1997; Abu-Nasr, 1997). Similarly, recent reports on the state of civil society in the U.S. do not record a sudden spurt in volunteerism or civic participation; in fact, the bipartisan National Commission on Civic Renewal (1998), co-chaired by former Senator Sam Nunn and former secretary of education William Bennett, documents "a clear and significant decline over the past quarter century" in an Index of National Civic Health. If a major increase in volunteerism has materialized, neither these sources nor the media has discovered it.

Other accounts paint a somewhat more optimistic picture. A (nonrandom) survey of the readers of NonProfit Times, a monthly trade publication, shortly after the Summit showed that 52.6 percent believed that the Presidents' Summit for America's Future had a "positive impact on the volunteer's role in society," but only a small number had experienced increases in potential volunteers since the event (Batchilder and Clolery, 1997, 1). In the survey of 580 nonprofit organizations, 91.1 percent said that in the first week after the Summit no change had occurred in the number of inquiries they usually receive. Of those who did receive calls, 60 percent reported 10 or fewer calls, and no organization reported more than 30 inquiries. In the second week, the reported number of calls from potential volunteers traceable to the Summit more than doubled to 19.2 percent of responding organizations. Of the organizations receiving such calls, the great majority (81.8 percent) reported 10 or fewer calls, and all of the remainder received fewer than 20 inquiries.

Perhaps the safest conclusion is that the response of volunteers to the Presidents' Summit has been very uneven. In a speech before the U.S. Conference of Mayors one year after the meeting (April 27, 1998), America's Promise Chairperson General Powell (1998) reported outstanding successes in recruitment experienced by such prominent organizations as Big Brothers Big Sisters and Boys and Girls Clubs and by some cities, for example, Louisville (KY) and Kansas City (KA and MO). In speeches and interviews, Powell is able to recount dramatic advances in volunteering in areas where he has visited and lent his remarkable charisma. Other accounts indicate that nonprofit organizations, even those in close proximity, have had very mixed results in the recruitment of new volunteers in response to the Presidents' Summit (Dundjerski and Hall, 1998; Batchilder and Clolery, 1997; Miller, 1997; Abu-Nasr, 1997). As Betty Beene,

President of the United Way of America, a sponsor of the event, described it, the progress of local groups in response to the Summit has "ranged form heroically successful to something less than had been expected, ... but such differing results were inevitable" (Johnson, 1998).

The efficacy of the pledges made by national commitment-makers to the Summit agenda have not escaped scrutiny either. At the most fundamental level, critics point out that the problems confronting America's children cannot be addressed in isolation from those of their parents and recent changes in U.S. domestic policies affecting assistance to poor people; they argue that effective solutions or amelioration lie beyond the reach of volunteerism and philanthropy alone (Ellis, 1998; Goldstein, 1997; Eisenberg, 1997; Lemann, 1997; Jones, 1997). Summit organizers dispute this interpretation of the event. Perhaps their most articulate spokesperson is Harris Wofford (1997b, p. 24), Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National Service, another sponsor of the Summit: "The Summit ... does not suggest that volunteering can solve all our problems -- far from it. Rather, it reaffirms that profound but simple truth that progress is best made not by government action alone, but through the efforts of citizens and all sectors working together" (compare Wofford, 1997a).

Other critics take a more moderate position. While additional financial and volunteer support generated by the Summit is certainly welcome, many pledges may not constitute an infusion of new funding but continuation of existing programs and philanthropic activity that has been re-directed to gain visibility and approbation under the Presidents Summit/America's Promise umbrella (Miller, 1997; Alter, 1998). One analysis suggests that, "According to most corporations listing tangibles in The Promise Book [an America's Promise compilation], their contributions were already planned or in place long before the Presidents' Summit and the

subsequent organization America's Promise came along. What they appear to be doing is making a commitment to continue what is already being done" (Batchilder and Clolery, 1997, p. 6); eminent scholar Jon Van Til echoes this assessment, viewing the corporate contributions as "people moving a contribution that they would have given anyway and signaling it as part of the process" (Abu-Nasr, 1997). Some observers are more critical, seeing diversion of funds from youth organizations that were already up and running to the Summit agenda (Havemann, 1998). And as was the case with mobilizing new volunteers, the effects of marshaling commitments of funding and other support to the Summit have been highly uneven, with national and larger organizations reaping much greater benefits than smaller and local ones (Havemann, 1998; Dundjerski and Hall, 1998).

Finally, a host of more practical issues have been raised. Nonprofit officials point out that America's Promise lacks a measurement tool to assess the impacts of its activities on young people (Dundjerski and Hall, 1998). In an era in which foundations, governments, and other funding authorities routinely challenge nonprofit organizations to demonstrate (and evaluate) "outcomes," the emphasis on numbers — of volunteers, donations, and so forth — rather than on the quality and impact of this philanthropic outpouring is ironic (Ellis, 1998). A year after the Presidents' Summit, nonprofit officials continue to complain that America's Promise has not done enough in the area of follow-up, particularly to: monitor whether corporate commitments are honored; insure that commitments made at the national level reach the localities where needed (and provide mechanisms for local Summit delegations to draw upon the pledges); and avoid duplication, conflict, and confusion among commitment-makers and other organizations in a

crowded field. These charges were first leveled immediately after the Presidents' Summit and have been contested by America's Promise officials since (see Batchilder and Clolery, 1998a).

Despite these limitations, the Presidents' Summit for America's Future must be credited with important successes, most notably in raising the profile and significance of volunteerism, especially as a means to help young people. The Summit and America's Promise have also succeeded in recruiting more citizens to its youth service agenda and mobilizing greater commitments of monetary and other resources to support it than many would have thought possible. While initial predictions on the eve of the Summit, for example, that "Volunteers May Swamp Charities" (Dundjerski and Hall, 1997), may have been overly optimistic (to date), as noted above, some national organizations and localities appear to have had notable increases. Regardless of the magnitude of this new pool, is America's nonprofit social service sector poised and ready to make productive use of the additional volunteer capacity?

Volunteer Management

A final limitation of the Presidents' Summit for America's Future is the lack of attention to, or even interest in, the lifeblood of much of the sector, volunteer management. America's Promise has probably done less to address this issue than any of the others discussed above, yet the capacity and expertise to manage volunteers and to develop and expand programs that use them effectively are key to the ultimate success or impact of the Summit. The point, after all, is not simply to raise funds and recruit volunteers, but to translate this philanthropic energy into programs and activities that benefit America's children in the five areas identified in the Summit agenda: a relationship with a caring adult, safe places and structured activities after school, health

care, education in a marketable skill, and the opportunity to give back through service. Whether or not the Summit stimulates a large influx of new volunteers, efficient management is critical for making the best use of this vital resource.

From my own experience and that of other delegates and observers at the Presidents' Summit, the need to build and strengthen capacity in volunteer administration and management to support the anticipated influx of volunteers received little, if any, mention at the Philadelphia meeting (White, 1997; Bhavnani, 1997). Long-time trainer and expert in volunteerism and Summit delegate Sue Vineyard (1997, p. 11) found that "Unfortunately, the spotlight is not shining as brightly on the volunteer program professionals who must lead the efforts, and it may be that many will remain blind to the fact that someone has to physically manage and support all of the new and increased efforts that will come out of the Summit." Susan Ellis considered the Summit "worthwhile" but castigated the follow-up effort "because it showed not one scintilla of interest in building organizational capacity to utilize volunteers" (Havemann, 1998). According to Ellis (1998), America's Promise has not provided funding or technical assistance that would allow nonprofit organizations to hire or train volunteer coordinators, volunteer centers to carry out their mission as clearinghouses for volunteers, or paid staff to acquire and increase their skills in volunteer management.

These issues would not be so critical were the nonprofit sector already well-equipped to administer and manage volunteer programs. Michael J. Gerson (1997, p. 28) delivers a sobering assessment, however: "Most volunteers are not deployed effectively to solve the hardest, and most critical, problems. Management is often poor, and amazingly little is known about which

volunteer programs really work. To an extent rarely acknowledged publicly ... the volunteer sector is not ready for the responsibilities now being thrust upon it."

Although this judgement is sweeping, two recent, systematic studies seem to bear out the assessment of weaknesses in volunteer administration across the nonprofit sector. Following the Summit, the United Parcel Service (1998a) commissioned a national survey of 1,030 Americans to gauge the experience and attitudes of volunteers concerning host organizations. The most arresting finding of the survey was that two out of five volunteers reported that they had stopped volunteering for an organization at some point as a result of one or more poor management practices. Mentioned most often by the volunteers as a reason for quitting was that the host organization did not make good use of their time (cited by 23 percent), followed closely by the perceptions that: the organization did not make good use of their talents, skills or expertise (18 percent), volunteer tasks were not clearly defined (16 percent), or they were not thanked and recognized for their efforts (9 percent). According to the survey results, poor management practices actually resulted in more people quitting volunteering than people losing interest in the activity due to changing personal or family needs.

Like Gerson (1997), the UPS (1998a, p. 1) report concludes, "Managing volunteers effectively is a problem for many not-for-profit organizations. ... These organizations could accomplish even more if they could better recruit, mange and recognize the work of volunteers. These organizations often lack the resources to put systems in place that will allow them to get the most out of volunteers and retain them as committed workers .... The findings substantiate a crisis in volunteer management. Too many potential and active volunteers are turned off by what they regard as inefficient use of their time."

Of course, the UPS survey results consist of the reactions of volunteers, who may be (too) willing to hold host organizations responsible for their decision to quit volunteering. Nevertheless, a study and survey from the standpoint of volunteer-based organizations, although not nationally representative, uncovers many of the same problems (Bradner, 1998). To follow-up on the Presidents' Summit, in June 1997, the Illinois Commission on Community Service embarked on a year-long effort to develop a strategic plan for volunteerism in the state. Activities in this massive effort, in which 1,200 citizens eventually participated, included a state summit, six public hearings, and a retreat. The major issues that emerged from this process were the need to shore up liability protection for volunteers and expedite criminal background checks for those working with vulnerable populations such as children; both issues had precipitated problems in volunteer management. In the public hearings, attendees advocated for stronger volunteer centers, especially for more funding and support (Bradner, 1998, pp. 3-4).

The Illinois Commission also distributed a mail survey to 5,040 organizations with volunteer programs. Responding organizations were heterogeneous and appear to be representative of volunteer service-providers in the state (20 percent response rate). Like the studies above, findings from the survey again reveal shortcomings in volunteer administration and management. For example, respondents from less than half the organizations (46 percent) felt that their board of directors showed a lot of support for the volunteer program. Forty-four percent rated their volunteer program only poor or fair in supervising volunteers, and the same percentage gave themselves these ratings with respect to recognition activities for volunteers; just 60 percent gave themselves a good performance rating when it came to staff communication with volunteers. The area of evaluation garnered worse self-evaluations: Fewer than three out of ten

of the volunteer programs (28 percent) said that they measure the impact of volunteer efforts on the community they serve, and 70 percent gave themselves poor or fair ratings in evaluating the performance of volunteers. The survey also reported that budget constraints were a problem for many of these programs.

While the Presidents' Summit and its successor America's Promise have been preoccupied with recruiting volunteers and raising monetary and in-kind contributions, the needs of nonprofit organizations for effective volunteer management to cope with the rich harvest that organizers hoped to generate have gone largely unrecognized. Organizers seem to be guided by a "more is better" approach to volunteerism in which mobilizing large numbers of volunteers and corporate commitments is seen as the objective. Determining how to draw upon these resources and coordinate, support, and manage them are tasks left to the 140 Summit delegations and other nonprofit organizations participating in the Summit agenda to work out on their own (Batchilder and Clolery, 1998a). Yet, research suggests gaps in the mechanisms to do so at the local level that threaten the efficacy of even the flush resources commanded by the Summit. The literature leaves no doubt that absent organizational readiness and support for volunteer administration and management, much of the energy, skills, and good will underlying volunteerism will be dissipated (McCurley and Lynch, 1996; Ellis, 1996; Fisher and Cole, 1993; Brudney, 1990).

Seeing to the needs of nonprofit organizations for volunteer administration and management requires funding, time, and expertise. As the executive director of a women's self-help center put it, "An enormous amount of staff time, thought, and energy is necessary to train, support, schedule, and supervise our volunteers .... Thoughtful and well-planned utilization of volunteers brings additional costs to agencies. Let's not kid ourselves that those costs don't

exist" (Bennett, 1997, p. 48). These expenses can seem surprisingly dear, especially because most corporations and private citizens labor under the misconception that "volunteers are free" as well as other "myths,"as Brudney (1995) labels them, concerning these novel human resources. In fact, research on fire departments indicates that the costs of administration can reach $2,000 per volunteer. As administrative expenses rise toward this mark, departments should consider increasing the amount of paid firefighter hours until at approximately $1,500 per volunteer, the most cost-effective staffing arrangement is an even (50-50) mix of volunteer and paid hours (Duncombe and Brudney, 1995; Brudney and Duncombe, 1992).

In policy domains squarely within the Summit agenda -- mentoring -- the costs of volunteer administration are similar. In the highly-regarded Big Brothers Big Sisters organization, for example, screening, training, matching, and supervising a volunteer mentor costs about $1,000 per child. If Big Brothers Big Sisters were able to recruit all the volunteers it needed to meet its waiting list of 30,000 children nationwide seeking an adult mentor, the bill would come to $30 million. An estimated 15 million children could benefit from having mentors (Gerson, 1997, p. 28). If the goal of the Summit is to see to the needs of just 2 million more children at-risk, the price tag could soar to a staggering $2 billion for just this one of the five Summit agenda items. Executive Director Thomas McKenna states that "Businesses have a much easier time helping us with people than with dollars for infrastructure. They think all we need are volunteers showing up. But we also need hard dollars to hire the staff to carry out programs" (Miller, 1997).

In Philadelphia, host city to the Presidents' Summit, coordinating the volunteer effort in response to the meeting has been a "staff-intensive exercise" occupying two full-time staff members (Havemann, 1998). Many cities and regions not so fortunate have reportedly

experienced a slow start on the Summit agenda, largely because local coordinating bodies lack the employees, money, and other support to assume the additional duties of recruiting, mobilizing, and coordinating volunteers on top of full-time jobs (Dundjerski and Hall, 1998). The situation of my Summit delegation provides an illustration. Shortly after the event, the head of the delegation lamented to a New York Times reporter about problems in garnering resources to make good on our pledge to the Summit (Abu-Nasr, 1997). Eventually, we were able to secure a grant from the Points of Light Foundation through a competitive process for start-up of a volunteer center. As welcome and significant as this funding has been, the grant covers only about 33-40 percent of operating costs, is non-renewable, and requires us to raise matching funds. As we continue to scramble for resources, our pledge to the Summit is jeopardized. More importantly, the capacity of the fledgling volunteer center to serve the community suffers.

Perhaps because of experiences like these, the need to improve the capacity and practice of volunteer administration seems to be gaining greater resonance. As a result of the findings from the survey it commissioned, the United Parcel Service (1998b) has announced that it will fund $2 million in volunteer-management grants over the next two years, divided equally among five national nonprofit organizations: 100 Black Men, Big Brothers Big Sisters, Junior Achievement, the Points of Light Foundation, and the United Way of America. The grants are intended to build the capacity of nonprofit organizations to effectively utilize volunteers. Each organization is to develop model programs that can be replicated nationwide and, in turn, increase volunteer involvement and service to communities.

No one can dispute the magnanimity of this $2 million investment -- or the need for it. Yet, the funding comes relatively late in the (short) history of the Summit, and any ideas and

models generated would have to be packaged and diffused to the local level. Moreover, with more than $750 million in cash and in-kind donations pledged to the Summit agenda prior to the event and doubtless much more committed afterward to America's Promise, the priority accorded volunteer administration and management still remains a question.

An Empty Stage

The stage at Philadelphia's Independence Hall graced in late April, 1997 by the historic appearance of all living Presidents to show support for volunteerism in behalf of the nation's youth is now dark. What will happen to the enthusiasm and idealism they and other dignitaries helped to generate at the Presidents' Summit for America's Future?

The success of most any new volunteer initiative rests on the effort and dedication of a core group of founders and social entrepreneurs. The Summit gave local delegates great motivation, excitement, and the brief but white-hot light of public attention, the most intensive spotlight ever shown on volunteerism. It inspired corporations to raise their consciousness and contributions for an agenda aimed at helping children at-risk. Through working sessions at Philadelphia, it also afforded the opportunity for local delegations from around the country to discuss how we might interpret and implement the Summit agenda back home. These advantages are considerably more than greet the typical volunteer start-up, which normally enjoys a quiet and humble launch known only to a few close friends and eager clients, and little fanfare or technical assistance.

The Presidents' Summit for America's Future provided local delegations with the benefits of a privileged birth. Now, however, the parents are far from the local scene, and it has fallen

largely upon the delegations and their nonprofit partners to see to the care and nurturing of the offspring. The goals continue to motivate, yet too little resources and attention have been devoted to building and expanding the management capacity and expertise essential to bring them about. Is this movement yet one more American child at-risk? The year 2,000 offers the first real test.

References

Abu-Nasr, Donna. "Summit inspires few volunteers." Washington Post, October 25, 1997.

Alter, Jonathan. "Between the lines: Long after the trumpets." Newsweek, May 11, 1998, vol. CXXXI, no. 19, p.41.

Bennett, Barbara. "Don't forget the costs to charities of using volunteers." Chronicle of Philanthropy, May 15, 1997, vol. IX, no. 15, p. 48.

Batchilder, Melissa, and Clolery, Paul. "Road warrior Powell carries mentoring message: General says troops many stay longer." NonProfit Times, vol. 12, no. 6, April 1998a, pp. 1, 4-5.

Batchilder, Melissa, and Clolery, Paul. "Two summit convenors are still true believers in event's mission and volunteerism." NonProfit Times, vol. 12, no. 6, April 1998b, p. 11.

Batchilder, Melissa, and Clolery, Paul. "Summit's promise of volunteers, supplies slow to materialize." NonProfit Times, vol. 11, no. 10. July 1997, pp. 1, 6, 8.

Bhavnani, Mitzi. "Symposium: Presidents' Summit for America's Future." Journal of Volunteer Administration, 1997, vol. 16, no. 1 (Fall), pp. 2-19.

Blum, Debra E., and Susan Gray. "Hot firms cool toward philanthropy: Fastest-growing companies tend to stay focused on making money, not on giving it away." Chronicle of Philanthropy, May 15, 1997, vol. IX, no. 15, pp. 9, 12, 14.

Boldt, David. "Powell: Let me see you sweat." The Philadelphia Inquirer, April 8, 1997, p. R1.

Bradner, Jeanne H. "Strengths and weaknesses of volunteerism in Illinois and what that means to those who lead volunteers." Journal of Volunteer Administration , 1998, vol. 17, no. 1 (Fall), pp. 2-11.

Brudney, Jeffrey L. "The involvement of volunteers in the delivery of services: Myth and management." Pages 319-330 in Steven W. Hays and Richard C. Kearney (eds.) Public

Personnel Administration: Problems and Prospects: Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Brudney, Jeffrey L. Fostering Volunteer Programs in the Public Sector: Planning, Initiating, and Managing Voluntary Activities. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Brudney, Jeffrey L., and William D. Duncombe. "An economic evaluation of paid, volunteer, and mixed staffing options for public services." Public Administration Review, 1992, vol. 52 (September/October), pp. 474-481.

Bush, George. "Still on the point." Newsweek, April 28, 1997, vol. CXXIX, no. 17, p. 32.

Chambre', Susan M. "Kindling points of light: Volunteering as public policy." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 1989, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 249-268.

Duncombe, William D., and Jeffrey L. Brudney. "The optimal mix of volunteer and paid staff in local governments: An application to municipal fire departments." Public Finance Quarterly, 1995, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 356-384.

Dundjerski, Marina, and Holly Hall. "America answers call to help kids: A year after Presidents' Summit, charities gain many new partners." Chronicle of Philanthropy, April 23, 1998. Available at http://philanthropy.com.

Dundjerski, Marina, and Holly Hall. "Volunteers may swamp charities: Presidents' Summit raises questions about groups' ability to use the help." Chronicle of Philanthropy, April 17, 1997, vol. IX, no. 13, pp. 1, 22-24, 31.

Eisenberg, Pablo. "Clinton's Summit mustn't focus only on volunteerism." Chronicle of Philanthropy, February 20, 1997, vol. IX, no. 9, pp. 57-58.

Ellis, Susan J. "The bandwagon has no wheels: The Presidents' Summit one year later." 1998. Available at http://www.energizeinc.com/hot.html.

Ellis, Susan J. "Personal reactions to the Presidents' Summit on the Future of America." Journal of Volunteer Administration, 1997, vol. 16, no. 1 (Fall), pp. 6-9.

Ellis, Susan J. From the Top Down: The Executive Role in Volunteer Protram Success. Revised Edition. Philadelphia, PA: Energize, 1996.

Fisher, James. C., and Kathleen M. Cole. 1993. Leadership and Management of Volunteer Programs: A Guide for Volunteer Administrators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gerson, Michael J. "Do do-gooders do much good? Most volunteers aren't solving core problems." U.S. News and World Report, April 28, 1997, vol. 122, no. 16, pp. 26-34.

Goldstein, Henry. "The misguided message of the summit." Chronicle of Philanthropy, May 15, 1997, vol. IX, no. 15, pp. 49-50.

Hall, Holly, and Nicole Wallace. "Turning promises into reality: After summit on volunteering, charity leaders fear that offers of support may not be sustained." Chronicle of Philanthropy, May 15, 1997, vol. IX, no. 15, pp. 32, 37.

Havemann, Judith. "Army of volunteers doesn't answer call a year after summit: Vision of massive effort to aid poor is largely unfulfilled." Washington Post, April 26, 1998, p. A16.

Hodgkinson, V. A.; Weitzman, M. S.; Crutchfield, E. A.; Heffron, A. J.; and Kirsch, A. D. Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey, 1996 Edition. Washington, DC: Independent Sector, 1996.

Johnson, Dirk. "Powell's youth drive gains steam after sputtering." New York Times, June 14, 1998, p. A32.

Jones, Van. "Volunteer this!" Third Force, 1997, vol. 5, no. 3 (July/August), p. 10.

Lemann, Nicholas. "The limits of charity." Newsweek, April 28, 1997, vol. CXXIX, no. 17, p. 37.

McCurley, Steve, and Rick Lynch. Volunteer Management: Mobilizing all the Resources in the Community. Downers Grove, IL, 1996.

Miller, Judith. "Push for volunteerism brings no outpouring." New York Times, September 23, 1997, p. A18.

National Commission on Civic Renewal. "Briefing at the National Press Club regarding the erosion of civic life." June 24, 1998. Available at http://www.puaf.umd.edu/civicr.

Powell, Colin. "Remarks to Conference of Mayors on America's Promise." April 27, 1998. Available at http://www.americaspromise.org/NEspeech.htm.

Seita, Trudy. "Reflections of a delegate to the Presidents' Summit for America's Future." Journal of Volunteer Administration, 1997, vol. 16, no. 1 (Fall), pp. 3-5.

Shepard, Scott. "An 'army' with heart: Clinton, Powell, and other VIPs join 5,000 volunteers to spruce up Philly." Atlanta Journal/Constitution, April 28, 1997, p. A4.

United Parcel Service. Managing Volunteers: A Report to UPS. Atlanta, GA: Author, 1998a.

United Parcel Service. "The UPS Foundation awards $2 million in grants to expand volunteer service." Atlanta, GA: Author, March 30, 1998b.

Vineyard, Sue. "An open letter to volunteer program managers." Grapevine, May/June, 1997, pp. 11-12.

White, Barbara W. "The Summit for America's Future: A place for social work?" Social Work, 1997, vol . 42, no. 4 (July), pp. 317-318.

Wofford, Harris. "The aim is to harness all kinds of leadership." Philadelphia Inquirer, April 20, 1997a, pp. E1, E7.

Wofford, Harris. "The Presidents' Summit: A call to action." NonProfit Times, April, 1997b, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 24.