JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY
Center for Civil Society Studies
Institute for Policy Studies

Listening Post Project

A joint project of the Center for Civil Society Studies at the Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies in cooperation with the Alliance for Children and Families, the Alliance for Nonprofit Management, the American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging, the American Association of Museums, Community Action Partnership, League of American Orchestras, Lutheran Services in America, Michigan Nonprofit Association, the National Council of Nonprofits and United Neighborhood Centers of America

Communiqué No. 13

Listening Post Project Roundtable on Nonprofit Advocacy and Lobbying

Washington, D.C.

Stephanie Lessans Geller and Lester M. Salamon
Johns Hopkins University

BACKGROUND

The Nonprofit Listening Post Project's Policy Advocacy Roundtable followed up on the project's 2007 survey focused on nonprofit engagement in the public policy process. This survey, or Sounding, found that America's nonprofit organizations are widely involved in efforts to influence the public policies affecting them and those they serve, but are constrained by a lack of adequate resources, including tight budgets and limited staff time (for the full text of the report on this Sounding, see www.jhu.edu/listeningpost/news).

To explore nonprofit involvement in the policy process in greater depth and identify the steps that might be taken to boost the scope, scale, and effectiveness of nonprofit policy advocacy, the Listening Post Project convened a Roundtable in July 2008. Participating in this session were experts in the nonprofit advocacy community and practitioners representing both nonprofit intermediaries and nonprofit service organizations of wide-ranging sizes working in a range of fields (see Attachment A in the Appendix for a complete list of Roundtable participants).

This Communiqué summarizes the major findings that emerged from this session, focusing first on findings from the field, and then turning to strategies that could help the sector strengthen its role and impact in the policy arena.

DIGGING DEEPER: KEY FINDINGS FROM THE TRENCHES

Roundtable participants generally confirmed the findings of the project's Advocacy Sounding and added useful insights into the factors at work. Three themes dominated the discussion:

a) Nonprofit involvement in advocacy and lobbying is extensive but constrained.

b) It is critical for nonprofit intermediaries and coalitions to be involved in policy advocacy and lobbying.

c) In the policy process, nonprofits fare better at defense (e.g., preventing cuts) than at offense (e.g., securing new policies).

A) Nonprofit involvement in advocacy and lobbying is extensive but constrained

Participants agreed with the Sounding's major finding—that a significant proportion of nonprofits are involved in advocacy and lobbying, but that this involvement is constrained. The discussion revealed six important limitations:

- **Resources:** As revealed by both the Sounding and the Roundtable discussion, nonprofits lack the resources they need to engage in policy advocacy as frequently and as deeply as they would like. Participants emphasized that, with few exceptions, foundations have not provided strong support for nonprofit advocacy activities. As Carol Fredrich (Executive Director, Lutheran Metropolitan Ministry) explained, "Funding is one of the biggest barriers for us." Ms. Fredrich noted that a lack of organizational resources often results in the Executive Director having responsibility for all advocacy efforts. But because funding challenges also often force the executive director to wear many hats, she often has to push advocacy to the side. Anita Farley (Managing Director, Georgia Ensemble Theatre) echoed Ms. Fredrich's point: "I am in that very position as Executive Director. I just don't have the time to research all of the relevant legislation."

Many participants indicated that the United Way is one of the few funders that have supported advocacy efforts. As such, participants expressed significant concern that the United Way's recent decision to focus its giving on three issue areas (education, health and income) would eliminate a major component of their advocacy budgets. For example, Molly Greenman (President & CEO, Family & Children's Service) explained that a major reason why her organization has had the capacity to be involved in policy advocacy over the years is the support it has received from the United Way. Due to the United Way's new model, however, Family & Children's Service will lose $300,000 next year, 37 percent of its policy and civic engagement budget. As Ms. Greenman emphasized, "This will have a huge impact on our ability to do advocacy work and help people in the community build their own voice."

"Funding is one of the biggest barriers for us."

- **Image:** Some participants expressed concern that their advocacy efforts are frowned upon by the community. Demonstrating the power of this, one nonprofit participant noted that her organization intentionally eliminated its advocacy activities when it re-wrote its mission because it was worried about the "political correctness" of such involvement.

Similarly, several participants noted that their organizations have shied away from advocacy around issues affecting the people they serve (vs. advocacy geared to their specific programs and funding) because they worry that such advocacy work would offend their donor base, board members, and the general public. As Carol Fredrich explained, "It is harder to do the advocacy for purely 'the people.' You run the risk of offending your donor base and the people in the community because you are talking about the haves vs. the have-nots and removing systemic barriers."

- **Boards:** Several participants emphasized that they feel inhibited by their boards from getting involved in policy advocacy, and particularly advocacy around the issues that could affect their clientele and community (vs. issues relating to their programs and funding). Providing a clear example of this, Peter Goldberg (President and Chief Executive Officer, Alliance for Children and Families and United Neighborhood Centers of America) noted, "I don't know of many service-providing organizations in our field who will address the issue of gun control. Our boards don't want to engage in this type of issue."

Explaining this challenge, Mr. Goldberg pointed out that in the human service field, nonprofit boards have grown more conservative over the past twenty years. "This creates a tension in our organizations that is sometimes easier to avoid by staying away from policy and advocacy." Other participants noted that in light of funding challenges, they feel pressured to stack their boards with wealthy community members who possess strong fundraising skills. Hoping to maximize their chances of attracting such people, they focus their advocacy solely on the organization's programs and funding and avoid broader policy issues that could spark controversy.

- **Government:** Not surprisingly, participants also mentioned that the government constrained their advocacy efforts, most commonly through the existing laws and regulations that govern nonprofit involvement in advocacy and lobbying. In addition to current laws, however, participants pointed out that policymakers' lack of understanding about the nonprofit sector likely limits nonprofit effectiveness in the policy process. Building on this, several participants expressed concern that as nonprofits become more involved in for-profit activities (and thus, the lines between the sectors blur), policymakers will fail to grasp the unique characteristics of the sector and the numbers of people nonprofits represent—features that could enhance the sector's influence in the policy arena. Moreover, participants worried that many nonprofits' strong reliance on public funding creates the image that nonprofits are either part of "big government" or contractors. As one participant explained, "[These misunderstandings] sap the sector's political and moral capital, and make effective lobbying and advocacy more difficult."

- **Tension between services and advocacy:** Many participants, and particularly those in the social services field, described a tension between service delivery and advocacy work. Participants explained that when organizations grow and become more professionalized, they become more wary of getting involved in controversial policy issues, which could offend their donor base, potential donors, and affluent board members. Moreover, as professional staff members are often overworked just performing direct services, they have little time to devote to advocacy work.

  Participants also noted that this has had an especially severe effect on grassroots advocacy. Thus, while participants agreed that grassroots advocacy could be extremely effective to help change policy, many noted that they lacked the capacity to engage their clients in policy activities while performing their critical direct service work. As Carol Fredrich explained, "It takes a great deal of effort to involve the people that you are serving. It's very hard to take on, especially since your service people already have so much to do."

- **Emphasis on outcome measurements:** Many participants also emphasized that their organizations' increasing focus on outcome measurements—a major trend in the nonprofit sector—has had a negative effect on their involvement in policy activities given the difficulty inherent in measuring the short-term impact of policy advocacy and lobbying. As one participant stressed about his field, "We have such a strong business orientation to human services. With the emphasis on outcome programming, advocacy is seen as too weak of an activity." Foundations were seen as a major force behind this trend because they are increasingly requiring grantees to measure tangible outcomes and evaluating their grant applicants' ability to effectively do so as part of their grant-making decision process.

B) Coalitions and intermediaries are crucial

Participants universally agreed that advocacy coalitions and intermediaries are playing a major role in nonprofit advocacy and lobbying, both as a substitute for the involvement of some organizations and as a spur to involvement by others. Coalitions/intermediaries were seen as groups that could advocate on behalf of organizations that lacked the resources or legal ability to do so or were concerned about speaking out on their own, and that could provide resources and the training many nonprofit organizations need to engage effectively in the policy process. However, the discussion also revealed that coalitions/intermediaries often have major limitations in terms of inventiveness, permanence, and resources.

"We teach [our members] how to talk about what they do and the issues of people they are serving...This is the most proactive I have ever seen members be."

Demonstrating how intermediaries can substitute for the involvement of some nonprofits, the Community Development Council of Greater Memphis advocates around issues its members feel are critical to the housing industry but lack the comfort and resources to work on themselves. However, with a total budget of just $200,000, the Community Development Council is itself constrained in the work it can take on.

On the other side, illustrating how intermediaries can help boost nonprofit advocacy, intermediaries were praised for their work researching issues and providing local organizations the resources they needed to advocate effectively. As one intermediary (Marsha Greenfield, Senior Legal Counsel, American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging) noted, "We teach [our members] how to talk about what they do and the issues of people they are serving. And after several years, we can really see this concept mushrooming! This is the most proactive I have ever seen members be." However, she also pointed out that it is hard to measure how well her member organizations are able to involve their constituencies (residents, staff, families, boards) in advocacy efforts.

A serious concern raised about coalitions was that they themselves lacked adequate resources to advocate as effectively as possible. As a result, participants pointed out that these groups often are not as effective as they could be in terms of advocacy training, information-sharing, and other critical activities. Moreover, without sufficient resources, they lack the ability to work pro-actively on policy issues and end up primarily working in a defensive "reaction mode."

Demonstrating the impact of a lack of adequate resources, Lee Mason (Director of Public Policy and Community Relations, Center for Nonprofit Advancement) noted that his organization spent significant time crafting and then pushing through a particular piece of legislation. However, as the Center lacked the resources to follow-up on the bill once it was passed, it never did so and began working on its next issue. This lack of follow-up was extremely costly—although the bill passed, it was never implemented.

Other participants emphasized that the advocacy strategies on which coalitions/intermediaries rely limit their effectiveness. For instance, one participant pointed out that many coalitions/intermediaries fail to recognize the importance of long-term relationship building, which limits their effectiveness and often results in these groups being primarily reactive and issue-focused. Similarly, because many intermediaries/coalitions lack deliberate, sophisticated strategies, they fail to have significant impact. One clear example of this is the over-use of e-mail: when coalitions/intermediaries send their members frequent e-mail alerts on every possible issue, eventually their members pay less attention to them. As one participant stressed, "The coalitions come out too often. If I would get one or two e-mails a year, I would respond. But when I get dozens, I end up ignoring them all."

"I often say to my colleagues that they should treat every elected official like a donor because I think that might help them understand the kind of relationship that I believe makes sense."

Lastly, participants noted that it is hard to sustain the momentum in a coalition over time, particularly around issues that are of "general benefit" and will not bring tangible benefits to individual members. It is particularly difficult to appeal to members who have to put their priorities on the back-burner when the coalition is focusing on other issues. Even in intermediaries and associations with longer track records, participants noted the challenge of staff turnover, which hampers relationship-building.

C. Nonprofits fare better at defense than offense

Participants agreed that nonprofit advocacy is more successful when nonprofits are responding to a proposed policy or legislative cut rather than when they are trying to pro-actively advance a policy proposal. Participants explained that it is much easier to create unity defending cuts than establishing new policy proposals. They also noted that this is rooted in our democratic system—since creating and passing new policies involves numerous steps and actors, it often requires a level of resources, commitment, and sophistication that many nonprofits and their intermediaries, as noted above, do not possess.

Illustrating this principle, Charles Ryan (Executive Director, Retired Senior Volunteer Association) pointed out that the National Association of RSVP Directors has successfully prevented cuts to the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) but has not been able to secure increased funding for the program. Mr. Ryan noted, "Years ago, the RSVP Program was threatened with substantial cuts. During the same period the fate of the Panama Canal was being debated. Congress got more mail on RSVP than on the Panama Canal. But while we can prevent a cut, we can't get an increase."

MOVING FORWARD

In light of these numerous and often inter-related challenges, what can be done to boost the scope, scale, and effectiveness of nonprofit policy advocacy and lobbying? Our Roundtable uncovered seven suggestions for moving forward.

a) Realize that effective advocacy and lobbying is about relationship building

A fundamental tenet of policy advocacy emphasized throughout the session by the participants most extensively engaged in the policy process was that effective advocacy and lobbying hinges on strong relationships. As such, organizations aiming to have impact on policies need to form and nurture personal relationships with policymakers.

One organization that relies heavily on this approach is the California Science Center. As Jeffrey Rudolph (President & CEO, California Science Center) noted, "I often say to my colleagues that they should treat every elected official like a donor because I think that might help them understand the kind of relationship that I believe makes sense." To develop such relationships, the Center frequently hosts congressional and legislative hearings in its facility, informs legislators when programs will be held in their districts and invites them to take part, asks legislators for input when recruiting board members, and encourages board members to participate in political functions. Highlighting the value of such an approach, Mr. Rudolph pointed out, "Whenever we do need something, we have a good relationship."

b) Approach policy advocacy more strategically and with greater inventiveness

In order to have greater impact on the policy process, nonprofits need to think more strategically and with greater inventiveness about their advocacy and lobbying activities. Nonprofits have numerous resources, including board members, volunteers, and existing personal relationships, all of which should be seen as assets that could be tapped to boost policy advocacy efforts.

The Monterey Bay Aquarium's successful "Seafood Watch" initiative clearly illustrates the powerful effect of a well thought out nonprofit advocacy campaign that effectively tapped one of the museum's key resources—its visitors. As Jim Hekkers (Managing Director, Monterey Bay Aquarium) explained, the Aquarium's Seafood Watch initiative encourages consumers and businesses to buy seafood from sustainable sources. To do so, it produced twenty million seafood wallet cards that highlight which seafood items are "best choices," "good alternatives," or should be avoided altogether. The cards are available free of charge to its visitors and anyone else who requests one. After the cards were in circulation, the Aquarium then approached large-scale buyers to encourage them to only purchase sustainable seafood items. By developing a strategic two-pronged approach, i.e., targeting consumers and then large retailers, the Aquarium is effectively helping to shift seafood purchases to more sustainable items. In fact, as a result of its efforts, ARAMARK, one of the country's largest food service companies, has agreed to buy its seafood from sustainable sources. In describing this campaign's success, Mr. Hekkers emphasized, "We had to strategically involve consumers and the big buyers because companies like ARAMARK wouldn't have paid any attention to us at all if they were not seeing a lot of people who would pull out their seafood cards to see what they could eat."

Throughout the day-long Roundtable session, participants made many other useful suggestions for how nonprofits could approach advocacy and lobbying with greater creativity and skill:

- **Board members:** Board members are critical organizational assets that could help advance policy efforts. Because board members are often well-connected in the community, it is important to explore how their social networks could be tapped to boost the organization's policy advocacy and lobbying. Board members also could take on specific advocacy and lobbying roles. For example, participants stressed that politicians are often more affected by a personal visit from a board member than from the organization's paid staff.

  However, participants cautioned that organizations often need to devote significant time and energy to educating board members about specific policy issues and the importance of policy advocacy more generally. Some also noted that board members tend to be more effective advocating around narrow, focused issues.

- **Clients/customers:** Another untapped resource is often an organization's clients or customers. As one participant explained, influence in political circles is derived primarily from money and constituent influence. Since the sector cannot win an "economic slug-fest" with big business, it must counter the influence of "big money" with the influence of many constituents.

  Many participants recounted the powerful effects of their clients'/customers' stories on elected officials. Demonstrating this, Carol Fredrich noted, "We had a person who was formerly incarcerated speak on our behalf and that had much more of an impact. He lent the advocacy efforts greater credibility." Participants also stressed that when clients/customers share their personal stories with board members, the board members are significantly more likely to support organizational advocacy efforts.

- **Volunteers and interns:** Because lack of staff time is a major impediment to the sustained involvement by nonprofits in policy advocacy and lobbying, volunteers and interns should be seen as important resources that could help nonprofits carry out advocacy-related activities. One frequently overlooked group comprises retiring baby-boomers, who are often looking to be engaged in meaningful activities rather than in traditional, clerical volunteer functions. Highlighting the potential value of engaging volunteers in advocacy efforts, Howard Bedlin (Vice President, Public Policy and Advocacy, National Council on Aging) pointed out that many are very trustworthy and have relevant expertise.

- **Expertise:** Another critical organizational asset is its issue or client-specific expertise. Nonprofits need to identify and then highlight their unique expertise to government officials, who often value such knowledge. As Patrick Lester (Senior Vice President for Public Policy, Alliance for Children and Families and United Neighborhood Centers of America) explained, a significant proportion of policies are made by congressional staff, and "nonprofit advocates have influence in that context because of their expertise or perceived expertise." Adding to this point, another participant argued that, "Government welcomes our participation because they know we're in touch with the people that we are serving."

- **Technology:** Technologies often offer a cost-effective way to increase the scope and scale of advocacy efforts. Numerous participants highlighted the positive results they achieved by strategically targeting e-mail blasts to specific government officials. Survey Monkey was also touted as a simple tool that could help nonprofits easily gain the data they need to guide their advocacy efforts. As Howard Bedlin emphasized, "We are very concerned with staying in touch with the people we serve and knowing their issues. Survey Monkey is a good and easy way for us to do that." Participants also pointed out that nonprofits should explore tapping technologies that are popular with the younger generation (e.g., Facebook, blogs, etc.) to boost the impact of their advocacy work.

- **Flexibility:** Organizations that have remained significantly engaged in advocacy activities stressed the importance of relying on numerous techniques and adapting to political realities. Illustrating this flexibility, Family & Children's Service shifted away from lobbying when its state government became more conservative and less responsive, and instead began to focus on helping the local community build its own voice. As Molly Greenman explained, "When you do this work, it is kind of like water. When you run into an area of resistance, you have to go in a different direction." This enabled Family & Children's Service to maintain an important role in the policy realm and promote positive change in the community.

- **Partnerships:** Given the challenges nonprofit organizations face advocating on their own, many nonprofits have joined forces with others in the sector around policy issues. Participants noted that "strange bedfellow" partnerships can be particularly effective because they draw significant public attention and thereby pressure and/or impress lawmakers. Examples of such partnerships include Catholic Charities joining forces with Planned Parenthood, and the American Heart Association joining forces with the Soybean Growers.

c) Integrate advocacy into all aspects of the organization

Organizations represented at the Roundtable that were most extensively involved in policy advocacy had one commonality—advocacy was integrated into many components of their organizations. Thus, advocacy was mentioned in their mission statements, strategic plans, staff job descriptions, board job descriptions, and budgets. Highlighting the importance of such an approach, one participant emphasized, "A lack of integration of advocacy into an organization's plan will result in advocacy that is either defensive or responsive to external forces rather than advocacy that can help solve problems or achieve [the organization's] ambitions."

"When you do this work, it is kind of like water. When you run into an area of resistance, you have to go in a different direction."

In response to the participants who noted that board member resistance limited their organization's involvement in policy advocacy, those with such integration emphasized the particular importance of outlining the board members' role in policy advocacy in board job descriptions. Illustrating the positive effect of such explicit policy involvement at the board level, Molly Greenman noted, "We actually have found that people want to be on our board because of this. Policy involvement is really important to them."

d) Invest in intermediaries at all levels

Given the numerous barriers to nonprofit advocacy activities at the agency level, strong local, state, and national intermediaries capable of boosting nonprofit advocacy efforts are critical. However, as pointed out above, intermediaries also often lack adequate resources, limiting their effectiveness and impact. As such, participants emphasized that it is critical to invest in intermediaries working at all levels.

e) Intermediaries must approach policy advocacy more strategically and with greater inventiveness

Similar to the nonprofits they represent, intermediaries need to think more strategically and with greater inventiveness about their advocacy and lobbying activities in order to have greater impact on the policy process. Specific recommendations include:

- **Focus on long-term relationships:** As policy advocacy hinges on positive relationships between nonprofits and government officials, intermediaries not only need to nurture such relationships for themselves, but also need to help their members develop the skill-sets needed to build their own relationships with policymakers.

- **Rely on a range of tools:** Participants noted that intermediaries often over-use certain advocacy tools (e.g., e-mail blasts), which severely limits their effectiveness. Providing a clear example of this, an executive from one intermediary mentioned that only a handful of his member CEOs participate in the intermediary's annual policy day—the day on which they are invited to join the intermediary on Capitol Hill to discuss key issues with legislators. In the conversation that followed this disclosure, it became clear that the intermediary's over-reliance on this tool resulted in its members becoming less excited about each policy day. Because the intermediary did not want to abandon policy days altogether, Roundtable participants suggested opening policy days to others such as the board members or clients/customers of member organizations. This not only would make each policy day more exciting, but also could have greater impact on legislators, who often weigh input from volunteers and stakeholders more heavily than input from paid staff.

- **Enhance education efforts:** Given the significant effort required to remain up-to-date on current policy issues, several participants noted that intermediaries could increase their impact by helping nonprofits with this task. Specifically, participants indicated that it would be extremely valuable for the sector as a whole if intermediaries played a larger role in collecting information about legislation and relevant policy issues, packaging it, and distributing it to organizations working on the ground. Grassroots and service-oriented organizations could use such information to educate their boards and clients/customers as well as in supporting their own policy advocacy activities. Participants pointed out that in addition to issue-specific information, service-oriented organizations would benefit tremendously from information about the legislative process more generally.

f) Educate legislators and the public about the nonprofit sector, and consider legislative changes

As highlighted above, misconceptions about the sector held by both government officials and the public at large limit the sector's impact in the policy-making process. As such, many participants emphasized that the sector must re-assert its identity as the provider of services and functions vital to society that are not provided or supported by the market—an identity that has been diluted since the sector has become more reliant on government funding and contracts. Moreover, participants stressed that this "value proposition" must clearly articulate that the sector has an inherent advocacy function. By helping government officials recognize the importance of nonprofit engagement in the policy arena, participants hoped that the government would routinely add funds for advocacy activities to grants made to the sector and offer new advocacy-focused grant opportunities.

To re-assert such an image, participants suggested that a sector-wide intermediary (such as Independent Sector) create a clearly articulated typology of the sector that would emphasize this value proposition. This typology could then be used to educate government officials and the public about nonprofits, the sector's critical roles in public service and advocacy, and the limitations of existing advocacy/lobbying regulations. As one participant observed, by "marketing" this "nonprofit brand," the sector could help lawmakers and the public better understand the commonalities among the members of an increasingly diverse nonprofit universe and accept and value nonprofit engagement in the policy process. Participants also suggested that this intermediary develop a sector-wide policy platform that includes nonprofit-specific legislative goals.

Recognizing that the existing laws and regulations around nonprofit advocacy and lobbying prevent many nonprofits from actively engaging in the policy process, participants also thought it would be useful for the sector to educate itself about other possible regulatory frameworks and nonprofit funding structures (e.g., the European framework). Participants particularly emphasized the value of identifying a new regulatory framework that does not generate excessive administrative and management costs. However, participants also stressed that any re-thinking of current U.S. laws must be done very carefully, as policymakers might use this as an opening to strengthen the current restrictions on nonprofit policy engagement.

g) Encourage funders to support nonprofit policy advocacy

Participants stressed the importance of encouraging funders to support nonprofit policy advocacy and lobbying, as the majority are reluctant to do so. In particular, participants explained that because most foundations prefer to fund efforts that have measurable outcomes and immediate results, policy work—which is difficult to measure and often takes significant time to achieve impact— is often not supported. While adequate funding to support a policy-focused staff position would be high on many nonprofits' "wish list," participants also pointed out that "mini-grants" to cover the administrative expenses of their advocacy work (e.g., meeting space, conference calls, etc.) would also be particularly useful.

To boost funders' willingness to support nonprofit policy advocacy and lobbying efforts, participants emphasized the need to educate their current and potential funders on the existing advocacy/lobbying laws and regulations, and the value of nonprofit policy advocacy. In doing so, the sector should specifically emphasize (a) the importance of nonprofit advocacy as a means to give voice to marginalized groups, and (b) the role nonprofit advocacy could have in advancing funders' own agendas. National nonprofit associations were recognized as one viable group that could make these cases to the foundation community.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to our Johns Hopkins colleagues, Hillary Belzer (design and production), Mimi Bilzor (editorial guidance), Megan Haddock, Chelsea Newhouse, Erin Rodgers (meeting support) and our extremely supportive project partners – Peter Goldberg and Peg Whalen of the Alliance for Children and Families, Tangie Newborn of the Alliance for Nonprofit Management, Philip Katz of the American Association of Museums, Katie Sloan of the American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging, Don Mathis of the Community Action Partnership, Jesse Rosen and Heather Noonan of the League of American Orchestras, Jill Schumann of Lutheran Services in America, Kyle Caldwell and Erin Skene-Pratt of the Michigan Nonprofit Association, and Ann Beltran of the National Council of Nonprofits.

Additionally, we are appreciative of the generous funding support we have received for the Listening Post Project from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Kresge Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Surdna Foundation.

We are especially grateful to the Aspen Institute for hosting the Roundtable session and to the active participants who attended the event.

Appendix: Attachment A
Nonprofit Advocacy Roundtable Participant List

Howard Bedlin
National Council on Aging

Ann Beltran
National Council of Nonprofits

Rebecca Brundage
Children's Home & Aid

Lisa Carr
Lutheran Services in America

David Devlin-Foltz
Aspen Institute

Dia Duvernet
The Up Center

Anita Farley
Georgia Ensemble Theatre

Carol Fredrich
Lutheran Metropolitan Ministry

Peter Goldberg
Alliance for Children and Families and United Neighborhood Centers of America

Marsha Greenfield
American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging

Molly Greenman
Family & Children's Service

Kay Guinane
OMB Watch

Jim Hekkers
Monterey Bay Aquarium

Sally Jacobson
Ephraim Historical Foundation

Philip Katz
American Association of Museums

Patricia Kornick
Presbyterian SeniorCare

Najean Lee
League of American Orchestras

Patrick Lester
Alliance for Children and Families and United Neighborhood Centers of America

Mayra Martinez-Fernandez
Independent Sector

Lee Mason
Center for Nonprofit Advancement

Larry Ottinger
Center for Lobbying in the Public Interest

Gail Ravnitzky Silberglied
American Association of Museums

Jeffrey Rudolph
California Science Center

Charles Ryan
Retired Senior Volunteer Association

Bill Schambra
Hudson Institute

Cinthia Schuman
Aspen Institute

Ben Shute
Rockefeller Brothers Foundation

Leigh Snyder Smith
Housing Alliance of York

Joe Thiessen
Voices for America's Children

Emily Trenholm
Community Development Council of Greater Memphis