



AN INITIAL LOOK AT  
**AMERICA'S  
PROMISE**

---

*SUCCESSES,  
CHALLENGES,  
AND OPPORTUNITIES*

AN INITIAL LOOK AT

# AMERICA'S PROMISE

---

*SUCCESSES,  
CHALLENGES,  
AND OPPORTUNITIES*

PETER L. BENSON  
YVONNE BUTLER  
HEATHER LIBBEY  
GARY WALKER

Copyright ©1999 by Search Institute, 700 S. Third Street, Suite 210, Minneapolis, MN 55415; 800-888-7828  
and Public/Private Ventures, One Commerce Square, 2005 Market Street, Suite 900, Philadelphia, PA 19103; 215-557-4400

*Serving through Stewardship*



This project was made possible by grants from Lutheran Brotherhood and The Pillsbury Company Foundation. Lutheran Brotherhood is a member-owned financial services organization of more than one million Lutherans joined together for financial security, volunteer service, and benevolent outreach. Lutheran Brotherhood's mission is to improve the quality of life for its members, to strengthen communities, and to aid Lutheran congregations and institutions. The Pillsbury Company Foundation is committed to leveraging its resources to enhance the future well-being of young people and, in consequence, foster stronger communities. The Pillsbury Company Foundation's goal is to help provide caring adult mentors and role models who will prepare and empower economically disadvantaged young people, ages 5-19, to become self-sufficient and contributing members of their communities.

We are grateful for the support and counsel provided by Tamra Boyce, Marilyn Erickson, Jennifer Griffin-Wiesner, Kay Hong, Carol Paschke, and Renee Vraa at Search Institute; Jean Grossman and Karen Walker at Public/Private Ventures; and Peter Gallagher, Gregg Petersmeyer, and Jim Scheibel of America's Promise. We are especially grateful to Nathalie Pyle, Coordinator, Minneapolis Promise for Youth; Tony Thurmond-Krajewski, Director, San Francisco Promise; Lisa Quisenberry, Director, Hands On Charlotte; and their respective staffs for their rapid scheduling and organizing of the interviews.

# CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	GENERAL FINDINGS .....	2
III.	CONCLUSION .....	10
IV.	APPENDIX A: RESEARCH METHOD .....	11
V.	APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTIONS OF PUBLIC/PRIVATE VENTURES AND SEARCH INSTITUTE .....	14

# INTRODUCTION

In April 1997 the Presidents' Summit for America's Future declared a national call to action on behalf of America's young people. Summit leaders, including Presidents Bush, Clinton, and Ford, asked for corporations, individuals, philanthropies, nonprofits, and entire communities to "commit" for youth. Specifically, they were asked to expand the reach and impact of five essential "nutrients" that all youth need to develop successfully:

- caring adults;
- safe places and structured activities;
- a healthy start for a healthy future;
- marketable skills; and
- opportunities to give back through service to one's community.

Two years later, there exists a thick book of such commitments and new commitments are announced weekly. Equally significant, more than 400 communities have organized to secure and deliver these essential nutrients to their youth. They have become, in the language of America's Promise (the organization devoted to following up on the Presidents' Summit's call to action), "Communities of Promise."

This brief report represents a preliminary effort to document how the effort has taken root in three of these Communities of Promise: Charlotte, North Carolina; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and San Francisco, California. This early documentation is not a formal evaluation but an exploration of the progress and issues that mark the work of these communities. Search Institute and Public/Private Ventures will use this information to inform the design of a large-scale assessment of the work of America's Promise over the next several years.

America's Promise, Search Institute, and Public/Private Ventures agree that the findings from the more comprehensive study will be useful to policymakers, funders, and community youth development initiatives across the country. America's Promise is distinctive in the recent history of major initiatives for youth in that it is not focused on solving particular problems (e.g., teen pregnancy, drug addiction, school dropout) but rather on providing a group of developmental supports that studies indicate are highly connected with successful childhood and adolescence. It sits squarely in the "preventive" and "youth development" movements—movements which are increasingly attractive to a broad group of funders, policymakers, and policy analysts, but which do not have a strong record of significant public policy support. The performance of America's Promise will be greatly informative about the future of youth development as an organizing framework for community mobilization, programming, and legislation on behalf of America's youth.

# GENERAL FINDINGS

Researchers from Search Institute and P/PV spent several days in each of the three study sites interviewing key local decision-makers and representatives of organizations involved in youth policy and programming. The sites were chosen because of their geographic diversity and their reputations for having broad bases of support for youth development activities; we wanted in this early look to detect the “promise” in America’s Promise.

Interviewees came from the public, nonprofit, philanthropic, and business sectors. Some were involved in local Promise activities, others were not. Some had been local representatives to the Presidents’ Summit in Philadelphia, others had not. (Appendix A lists interviewees from each community.) Although three days of interviews cannot provide a comprehensive or in-depth picture of these communities’ attitudes and activities vis-a-vis America’s Promise or youth development, the interviews did provide sufficiently useful and varied information on which to base some general observations and findings.

These observations and findings suggest the potential that currently exists in communities across America to establish a basic threshold of opportunities and supports for adolescents. They also indicate the challenges that must be addressed—both nationally and locally—if that potential is to achieve practical fruition.

The specific findings are discussed below.

## **1. *Two years after the Presidents’ Summit there are a group of leaders in each community with intense commitments to the Summit’s goals. The breadth of that commitment varies widely.***

The Presidents’ Summit was a highly visible call to action around five specific needs of children and adolescents—without a particular process agenda or financial support for action once the Summit had ended. (There was an eight-hour session at the Summit where local delegates met to discuss what they’d do when they got home.) The Summit’s follow-up organization, America’s Promise, was not in place or staffed for several months following the Summit. Thus, delegates returned to their communities with considerable enthusiasm but little in the way of action plans or national guidance on what to do next.

This was not an insignificant dilemma. Successful motivational calls to action typically focus on very particular, short-term objectives or on actions totally within the control of individuals. Broader calls to action—those that require the involvement of many individuals and organizations over a long period of time around a number of goals—typically require extensive organization and resources.

Therefore our initial question was: Did the early commitment still exist and to what extent? It was entirely possible that the Summit’s effects existed primarily in the memories of its attendees. We found that the early commitment and passion does still exist in active form. In each of the three communities there is a group of

individuals highly committed to the Summit's broad call for greater commitment to adolescents and to its specific framework of five essential nutrients. In each community these individuals have some measure of influence, stature, and control over resources. They are all engaged in activities to further the Summit's goals.

The depth and reach of this commitment and passion varies widely among the three communities and is highly related to the manner in which Summit attendees were chosen and which community sectors they represented. In Minneapolis, for example, a selection committee undertook a significant outreach and involvement process to choose its 10 delegates. Its final delegation reflected a sense of "representation" of the total community. The selection processes in Charlotte and San Francisco were less extensive.

***The depth and reach... varies widely among the three communities.***

The current breadth of commitment among community leaders in each community who have influence over policy, programs, and resources for youth also directly reflects that early selection process. Minneapolis has widespread involvement and enthusiasm for the Summit's agenda. San Francisco's involvement is less extensive, though it still accurately represents the various sectors (business, youth, nonprofit, public, and civic) because its original delegates included key individuals from each of those sectors. Charlotte did not initially include business or youth representatives and continues to have difficulty involving those groups.

The state of commitment in the three communities is in many respects a reflection of the Summit's emphasis on organizing a national event, dominated by national leaders and national commitments. Community representation became an issue for the Summit's planners late in the process, as did the issue of what communities were expected to do following the Summit. America's Promise was not organized to address such issues until well after the Summit had ended. Thus, it is not surprising that the current breadth of local commitment varies widely and reflects the particular locality's choices of process and delegates.

**2. *The Summit's framework of five specific nutrients is the bedrock on which ongoing local organizing, programmatic, or advocacy activities rests.***

A call to action on behalf of America's youth can mean many things: new programs; new legislation; changes in adult attitudes and behaviors across a wide variety of fronts; community mobilization. Thus the ongoing visibility of America's Promise and its well-known and highly respected leader, General Colin Powell, can have a variety of effects and importance. Some of these effects—such as broad changes in adult attitudes and behaviors—are hard to detect and document in the short term.

This brief assessment—unlike the planned larger and longer study—could not attempt to capture the reality of those larger social and cultural effects. Its aim was



to document the concrete and specific actions directly related to the Presidents' Summit and America's Promise. These immediate and documentable actions are important indicators of the early impact of the Summit's call to action and may be important assets in motivating any larger social and cultural effects.

Seen through this narrow, "activity-oriented" lens, the five essential nutrients laid out at the Summit have been the base around which local Promise activities have centered. That framework has been the main appeal for extending the breadth of local support and involvement, for organizing community-wide planning and leveraging new collaborations, and for generating concrete opportunities and supports for youth. Though it is impossible to say what would be happening locally if the Summit had not adopted a specific framework, it is clear that the framework has been used. San Francisco and Minneapolis have used it to organize their planning and to assess the state of youth development in their communities. Charlotte is also attempting to use the framework for that purpose, though their planning is less advanced. The widely accepted framework has streamlined the local process of coming to a set of goals and has encouraged, because of the goals' widely varying content, outreach to various segments of the community.

***The widely accepted  
framework has  
streamlined the  
local process.***

The downside of the five goals would be if they deterred, conflicted with, or confused existing community planning processes regarding how best to address youth needs. That does not appear to be the case. San Francisco had its own Youth Summit independent of the Presidents' Summit, but it adopted similar and consistent goals. Minneapolis is known for its highly collaborative planning approach and had little difficulty integrating that approach with the Summit's framework.

In addition to its use as an organizing, outreach, and planning tool, the framework has allowed these communities to support some new collaboratives and generate specific new programmatic activities. In both Minneapolis and San Francisco, Big Brothers Big Sisters and Boys & Girls Clubs have implemented partnerships to extend their services. In Minneapolis, several new partnerships between youth-serving organizations and corporations have come into being through the Promise planning efforts. In Charlotte, nonprofits and public agencies are collaborating to deliver all five nutrients to youth in five neighborhoods over the coming summer. In addition, grants to improve and extend the coverage of the Mayor's Mentoring Alliance have been generated through Promise activities.

These and other activities are cited by interviewees in each community as results of local Promise initiatives. They are evidence that the substantive agenda set forth at the Summit and advocated by America's Promise provides a concrete basis for a continuing Promise presence at the community level.

**3. *The administrative and funding support for local Promise organizing, planning, and programmatic activities has been slow to develop and largely volunteer.***

As noted earlier, Summit delegates were not necessarily selected with follow-up local action in mind, nor did the delegates leave the Summit with a clear plan of action and resources in hand to achieve it. Given that, the enduring commitment exhibited at the local level and the organizing and programmatic activities that have taken place are testament to the recognition among many Americans that our adolescents do need more intentional support, guidance, and opportunity. It also points to the fundamental validity of the five nutrient framework.

However, the organizing, planning, and programming that have taken place locally began slowly and have in the main only emerged over the past year. It took local delegates about a year following the Summit to gain the commitment of other important local decision-makers, organize the planning process necessary, and secure the modest funds necessary to begin work.

Minneapolis got off to the fastest start. This was in good part because of the process used to select delegates and because it relied on the local United Way, which was able to quickly free up resources for the staff work necessary to organize the follow-up planning.

San Francisco did not get staff for its Promise activities until June 1998 and considers that date—13 months after the Presidents' Summit—as the true start of its Promise agenda. The local United Way has also been supportive in San Francisco.

Charlotte delegates returned from the Summit committed to not creating a new organization or hiring paid staff. They have relied almost exclusively on volunteers. In January 1999, Charlotte got an AmeriCorps Fellow to coordinate its Promise activities.

The slowness of local Promise initiatives to build staffed organizations has several benefits. It has reduced the opposition from existing youth organizations and initiatives and made them more likely to participate in joint planning activities. It has blunted criticism that local Promise efforts are diverting scarce funds from direct service activities or are weakening existing youth service organizations. It means that local Promise activities, to the extent that they do generate new and effective services for youth, have a high benefit-to-cost ratio. It ensures that local Promise initiatives do not quickly become another program and leaves open their potential for wider organizing and advocacy.

Such modest organizational and staffing structures also have their cost. Their effectiveness is not based on organizational strength but is instead heavily dependent on the influence, and willingness to use it, of their key principals. As

***Local Promise initiatives do not quickly become another program.***



noted earlier, the speed and lack of process with which local delegates were selected has limited the potential for influence in two of the three sites. In those two sites, key local leaders and organizations are still not involved and some of them do not perceive their local Promise initiative as powerful enough to warrant their involvement. One key youth leader refused to be interviewed for this study saying it wasn't worth the time.

Modest infrastructure also leaves local Promise initiatives heavily reliant on the strongest local youth organizations to actually “do things,” since they are the only organizations with enough resources to undertake new initiatives. Boys & Girls Clubs and Big Brothers Big Sisters are the organizations most frequently mentioned as working together and carrying out concrete activities. Not surprisingly, then, much of the activity and progress is evidenced in two of the five nutrients, mentoring (caring adult) and after-school programs (safe places).

The costs of a modest, volunteer-oriented organizational structure do not have to outweigh the benefits—nor vice versa—and this brief study does not provide strong evidence for which direction the balance is headed. It does suggest that too thin an infrastructure may make it difficult to accomplish anything and that securing sufficient intensity and breadth of civic leadership involved in local Promise activities is critical.

**4. *The relationship of local Promise initiatives to America's Promise's national activities is, from the perspective of local Promise leaders, vital and could benefit from strengthening and clarification.***

Local Promise leaders feel strongly that connection to a national initiative is important—most would say essential—to their local success.

Part of that belief derives from the Summit itself, especially for those who participated. They almost unanimously found it inspiring and motivating. That experience has transferred unevenly, however, to those who did not attend. Some nonattendees are impressed that so many national leaders, including three presidents, were physically present and got behind the Summit's agenda. Others see the event as too star-studded and flashy to have enduring value. So the Summit itself leaves a core group of intensely committed participants, a surrounding ring of impressed participants, and a not insignificant group of those already involved in youth work who are skeptical of the Summit's long-term impact.

A group beyond the core group finds value in the five nutrient agenda established by the Summit and advocated by America's Promise. There is little consensus, though, on how best to achieve that agenda, or on its internal priorities.

A still larger group finds value in the ongoing leadership provided by General Powell. Most interviewees said that the establishment of more effective youth development practices in America, and in their communities, will require a national spokesperson with great credibility. They believe that Powell fits that bill. His visibility nationally as well as at local events is, from their perspective, the

continuous energy that is necessary to keep the movement alive and progressing in their communities. That view seems natural and sensible. Strong and credible national leadership is always useful to nascent local movements. It probably also reflects the modest organizational structure and reliance on volunteers of the Promise initiative in each community. Their influence is highly dependent on leadership strength and visibility given that they have so little organizational strength and so few resources to fall back on. They are not yet confident enough about the rootedness of their local initiatives to feel sure of progress without an active and visible General Powell.

***Strong and credible  
national leadership  
is always  
useful to nascent  
local movements.***

They would also like more connection to and support from the national America's Promise organization, particularly regarding media and funding strategies, connection with national commitments, and communication with and learning about the activities of other local Promise initiatives. This desire—like the need for General Powell's leadership—is understandable from a local perspective, but fraught with difficult and countervailing considerations at the national level. There are more than 400 Communities of Promise. The national organizational structure and resources required to carry out an effective central role beyond that of inspirer and advocate are considerable. In addition, the “opportunity costs” to the national organization of pursuing a broader central role have to be considered. If such an effort were undertaken, the visibility, advocacy, and inspirational roles might be diluted.

There are, however, costs to not taking on some of these broader roles. We found several instances where local Promise initiatives felt that they had received no benefit from national corporate commitments generated by America's Promise. In reality, the commitments were just not easily identified as such when they reached the local level. There were several instances where local Promise initiatives were planning media campaigns that they felt would have been more effective if integrated with a national campaign that occurred.

These national/local connection issues are difficult ones that require considerable thought and communication. To the extent that America's Promise keeps its focus on national visibility and commitment, Communities of Promise will find themselves inspired to action and intermittently rejuvenated, but not organizationally supported or connected to any significant degree and often unaware of when they are.

***5. There are several key strategic and substantive issues on which Promise communities may take not only different but conflicting approaches.***

We should note that we do not presume either (a) that there is an inherently “right” approach to these issues (specified below), or (b) that the national office of America's Promise should take a position on them, regarding how they are

addressed by Communities of Promise. It may be that simply generating more attention to and resources for adolescents is the bottom line for all Promise activities. Perhaps that goal is better and more enduringly achieved without a great deal of strategic or substantive conformity. Still, these issues that emerged from the interviews seem important to highlight. They will over time get resolved locally, with or without national guidance, and will bear on how effective Promise initiatives are judged, and judge themselves, to be.

***DURATION*** The Presidents' Summit initially stated that it would accomplish its goal of delivering the five nutrients to several million youth within three years. That goal now seems very ambitious, especially given the slow start at the community level. Most local participants judge that it will take a decade to accomplish the changes in attitude, policy, and use of resources required to affect such large numbers of youth. Their view on duration is influenced by the realization that they are largely on their own regarding resource development.

Local corporate representatives, on the other hand, almost uniformly think of a three-year commitment as long-term. They do not seem inclined to lengthen it.

If Promise communities are about “deep change” in the way adolescents are viewed, supported, and guided, three years are likely insufficient. If they are about corporate involvement and commitments—or believe that corporate involvement and commitment is critical—there is a good possibility they will find their progress slowing in the next several years. This issue is related to the next:

***PUBLIC POLICY*** Most advocates, certainly most policy analysts, no longer aim solely at public policy or public decision-makers in promoting their causes or policy choices. Philanthropies, businesses, the nonprofit sector, volunteers, the media, and civic leaders all are now viewed as part of the solution to important social issues. The Presidents' Summit and America's Promise have taken this multi-sector view and have emphasized the role of volunteers, corporations, and collaboration. But if the goal is to affect millions of youth, most living in resource-poor communities and families, public policy and dollars will inevitably have to be involved in the form of new commitments or altered commitments. Accomplishing changes in public policy is different work than mobilizing volunteers for direct service or securing foundation grants or corporate commitments.

The three communities examined are focusing primarily on volunteers and private resources. Local public policy advocates are largely uninvolved in Promise activities. The numbers of youth affected by Promise activities to date are correspondingly modest.

At some point, each Promise community may have to lower its numerical goals or become more actively involved in public policy and resource use debates. This is related to the next issue:

***UNIVERSAL OR TARGETED*** The youth development movement aims to ensure that all youth receive appropriate supports and opportunities. This is in contrast to previous policy initiatives that targeted services to youth with problems.

The difference is important conceptually and policy-wise. However, in any given community, with the usual limitations on resources, it may still boil down to this question: Do we focus on youth already in trouble, high-risk youth, disadvantaged youth, or youth in general? While the intent may be ultimately to address all youth, the early emphasis or starting point may be very different. The number of youth addressed, the concentration of resources and the success rate achieved will all vary according to these early decisions. This issue is related to:

***SUCCESS*** What is success for a Promise community? An increase in the nutrients delivered? A greater number of youth receiving all five nutrients? More collaborations to deliver the nutrients? A community media campaign on behalf of youth? A decrease in youth problems? An increase in school performance?

Ideally, these measures would all change concurrently. In reality, given limited resources and the need to set priorities, they may not be so tightly related and are not likely to occur simultaneously. Since Promise communities will within the foreseeable future have to justify their use of resources to funders and backers, each will have to decide how it wants to be evaluated and what measures are most appropriate.

The above five issues are all difficult ones, without easy or right answers. But in an age of accountability for all social initiatives, they will have to be addressed locally. Our early examination revealed different tendencies among the three communities. Since America's Promise is providing the inspiration and visibility for the overall Promise movement, it may want to consider whether the movement is at this point better served by America's Promise providing recommendations to communities or offering no guidance and letting each community forge its own answers.

# CONCLUSION

This preliminary look at three Communities of Promise reveals that the Presidents' Summit and America's Promise have in some respects set in motion and in other respects helped sustain a strong local interest in providing more effective supports and opportunities for adolescent youth. As one interviewee said, "It's easier to generate interest in little kids; for adolescents, we need all the help we can get. America's Promise is a great opportunity to build that interest."

If the challenge were just to build better programs, we might view these early findings less affirmatively. Two years after the Summit there is in each community still much planning and organizing to do. Though there are some programmatic successes, they are scattered and modest in scope and size.

***Growing up successfully  
requires more attention  
from adults... than in  
previous decades.***

But the challenge is more basic and broader. It is to build interest, commitment, and involvement across each community, to change the public's view toward adolescents, to increase awareness and understanding of youth needs, and to build better programs to address those needs. It is also to widen and deepen in parents, citizens, and all institutions—not just among youth providers—awareness that all youth are our country's future and that adults must take action to ensure that that future is positive.

Some will think these Promise efforts are particularly important because of the recent violence in Colorado. Such tragic events rightly cause national discourse on what can be done to prevent them. But in our view there are more fundamental, quieter social trends that should cause us to consider how we can better support, guide, and prepare our youth. These trends include less stable and cohesive community life, more two-parent worker families, more one-parent working families, fewer safe places, more serious consequences to youthful experimentation, and an economy less forgiving of early deficiencies in education. Growing up successfully requires more attention from adults, including the institutions and society they have created, than in previous decades.

Whether America's Promise and its Communities of Promise are part of an effective and durable response to this challenge remains to be seen. That is an empirical question, and time and the facts will tell. This early look indicates they are probing the broader issues and have provided catalytic energy that can trigger community dialogue, collaboration, planning, and action. The next three years should provide a clearer picture of whether this approach to promoting youth development at the national and community levels holds promise for the significant changes needed.

# APPENDIX A

## RESEARCH METHOD

### PURPOSE

The preliminary documentation and evaluation of America's Promise focused on how the initiative unleashes community capacity to increase access to the five fundamental nutrients: ongoing relationship with adults, safe places and structured activities, a healthy start, a marketable skill, and an opportunity to give back through community service. The study was organized around three core dimensions:

- *Commitment and Passion* (who resonates with it, who become the ambassadors and catalysts, how the framework is disseminated).
- *Infrastructure Building* (local leadership, planning, visioning, resource development, task forces, youth engagement).
- *Action* (what actions—by businesses, congregations, neighborhoods, individuals, youth organizations—have been triggered).

To understand the scope of impact in these three dimensions, we examined the local landscape of three Communities of Promise, using a qualitative, on-site research strategy. We gathered personal stories, site anecdotes, and tangible materials and exhibits from the communities that document how the communities have worked to unleash their capacity, and why and how they have been strengthened.

The study also attempted to identify factors that appear to be critical for sustaining actions across time, discover what resources Communities of Promise need to maintain momentum, and offer recommendations for the future of America's Promise.

### METHOD

We made site visits to Charlotte, North Carolina; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and San Francisco, California. The sites were selected on the basis of similarity in size of city, youth development environment, and designation as a Community of Promise. Local Promise coordinators or directors assisted in developing a contact list and schedule of interviews. Visits were completed over three to five days in each site.

We attempted to isolate how community capacity has increased in each setting by determining capacity before and after the movement. We identified why and how the communities have been strengthened by recording stories from the individuals and gathering specific anecdotal records from selected participants. The research field work included: (a) developing a background narrative on the broad community capacity before the movement by interviewing staff from selected major organizations in each city; (b) completing observations and examinations of program operations to isolate considerable detail on the sites' critical components, what they are supposed to accomplish, how they have been approached, and what



has been accomplished; (c) gathering site materials and exhibits that document the local movements; and (d) conducting interviews and focus groups with key staff, volunteers, youth, and other adults to get to the stories of how America's Promise has had an impact on each community.

Personal interviews and focus groups helped researchers gather data on the presence of task forces, action plans, needs assessments, new programs, policy changes, types of resources engaged, public awareness campaigns, and selection of messages.

The interviews were divided into the following sections and subsections.

1. *Commitment and Passion*
  - a. Intellectual and emotional buy-in by leaders
  - b. Intellectual and emotional buy-in by residents
2. *Infrastructure Building*
  - a. Leadership
  - b. Planning
  - c. Resource procurement
  - d. Organizational framework
3. *Action*
  - a. Sector engagement
  - b. Cross-sector collaborations
  - c. Expanded programs
  - d. New programs

We used three types of data collection methods: nonparticipant observation of meetings, individual and small group interviews, and focus groups of adults and youth. Some of the interviews were intensive but contained mostly structured questions, especially for business leaders and agency heads who had limited time; others were unstructured, especially when the members of the focus groups were not the persons we expected to interview or knew very little about their local Promise; and many were a mix of structured and unstructured questions, starting out structured and leaving room for open-ended follow-up questions. The data were coded and analyzed for common themes and trends that manifested in those questions. A list of interviewees follows.

## **INTERVIEWEES**

### *Charlotte*

United Way Youth Education Council Meeting – Focus Group

Bill Garcia, Community Investment Manager, United Way of Central Carolinas

Debbie Antshel, Director of Community Partnerships, Charlotte/Mecklenberg Schools

Lisa Quisenberry, Executive Director, Hands On Charlotte, and Chair of Charlotte Mecklenberg's Promise

Pat McCrory, Mayor of Charlotte

Terri Profit, President, Community Service Partners

Meg Robertson, Manager Youth Education Programs, Hands On Charlotte  
Annette Miller, AmeriCorps Promise Fellow  
McCrorey YMCA/Youth Agency Programmers on Teen Programming –  
Focus Group  
Marty Viser, Vice President, Corporate Contributions and Community  
Involvement, First Union  
Cynthia Flynn, Executive Director, YMCA Community Development

### *Minneapolis*

Harold Mezile, President, Metropolitan YMCA  
Jim Colville, President, United Way of Minneapolis  
Tene Jones, Director; Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board  
Annie Nelson, Youth Programmer, Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board  
Nathalie Pyle, Coordinator, Minneapolis Promise for Youth  
Colleen Moriarty, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office  
Youth Focus Group, Franklin Middle School/Beacon Site  
Corky Wiseman, Director, Powderhorn Park Recreation Center  
Linda Tacke, Executive Director, Big Brothers Big Sisters  
Commitments Work Group Meeting Observation  
Commitments Work Group – Focus Group  
Reatha Clark King, President, General Mills Foundation  
Dan Haugen, Executive Director, Neighborhood Involvement Program  
Emmett Carson, President, The Minneapolis Foundation  
Ian Kaminski-Coughlin, Youth Delegate, and Co-Chair, Youth Involvement  
Committee, Minneapolis Promise for Youth  
Molly Greenman, Senior Vice President, Programs, Family & Children's  
Services

### *San Francisco*

Donna Hall, Director of Marketing, San Francisco Radio Group  
Larry Del Carlo, Director, San Francisco Unified School District Business and  
Community Development  
Bob Langseth, Executive Director, San Francisco Boys & Girls Clubs  
Regina Neu, Executive Director, Big Brothers Big Sisters  
Sam Piha, Executive Director, Community Network for Youth  
Chuck Greene, Executive Director, The Volunteer Center of San Francisco  
Kristina Moriarty, President, KMY Consulting  
Jim Richards, Executive Director, Columbia Park Boys & Girls Clubs  
Nora Silver, Director, Volunteerism Program, United Way  
Tony Thurmond-Krawjewski, Director, San Francisco Promise  
AmeriCorps Promise Fellows – Focus Group  
Eleanor Clement-Glass, Program Executive for Education, San Francisco  
Community Foundation  
Diana Aranda, Program Officer, San Francisco Community Foundation  
Joe Andrews, Former Deputy to the Mayor  
Connie Dubin, Program Officer, Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Foundation  
Dennis Isner, Youth Leader  
Joy Ferguson, Director, San Francisco Mentoring Coalition

# APPENDIX B

## DESCRIPTIONS OF PUBLIC/PRIVATE VENTURES AND SEARCH INSTITUTE

### **PUBLIC/PRIVATE VENTURES**

Public/Private Ventures is a national nonprofit organization whose mission is to improve the effectiveness of social policies, programs and community initiatives, especially as they affect youth and young adults. In carrying out this mission, P/PV works with philanthropies, the public and business sectors, and nonprofit organizations.

We do our work in four basic ways:

- We develop or identify social policies, strategies, and practices that promote individual economic success and citizenship, and stronger families and communities.
- We assess the effectiveness of these promising approaches and distill their critical elements and benchmarks, using rigorous field study and research methods.
- We mine evaluation results and implementation experiences for their policy and practice implications, and communicate the findings to public and private decision-makers and to community leaders.
- We create and field test the building blocks—model policies, financing approaches, curricula and training materials, communication strategies, and learning processes—that are necessary to implement effective approaches more broadly. We then work with leaders of the various sectors to implement these expansion tools and to improve their usefulness.

P/PV's staff is composed of policy leaders in various fields; evaluators and researchers in disciplines ranging from economics to ethnography; and experienced practitioners from the nonprofit, public, business, and philanthropic sectors.

### **SEARCH INSTITUTE**

Search Institute is an independent, nonprofit, nonsectarian organization whose mission is to advance the well-being of adolescents and children by generating knowledge and promoting its application. The institute conducts research and evaluation, develops publications and practical tools, and provides training and technical assistance. The institute collaborates with others to promote long-term organizational and cultural change that supports the healthy development of all children and adolescents.

Specifically, to accomplish its mission, Search Institute:

- conducts scientific research studies of children and adolescents;

- evaluates child and adolescent programs and policies;
- communicates research and evaluation findings to youth-serving professionals, parents, policy makers, and the general public; and
- translates research findings into products, training, and other services and resources.

The Search Institute team includes more than 70 staff members, located at Search Institute's headquarters in Minneapolis and a satellite office in Denver, and a team of contract trainers throughout the country.

