

SOCIAL JUSTICE FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN AND YOUTH

February 27, 2009

TRANSCRIPT

KATHY KRETMAN: Welcome. My name is Kathy Kretman and I direct the Center for Public and Nonprofit Leadership in the Georgetown Public Policy Institute here at Georgetown University. I thank each of you for being here today.

This is the third forum in the Waldemar A. Nielsen Issue Forums in Philanthropy, in which we examine the role of philanthropy in shaping public policy. The series grew out of a conversation with the good folks at the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. We all know that people in philanthropy talk with their peers, their grantees and others in their networks; and we know that public policymakers talk within their networks. We think it is important to bring these two networks together. Historically, philanthropy has played an important role in stimulating change in this country - in the civil rights movement, today in global health, working on social justice issues, in public education reform and so forth. We knew we wanted to bring parties together to have this important conversation.

Of course, we designed these forums a year ago - before the change in administration, before the economy came undone. But I think the conversation is even more important today.

Shay Bilchik served on our advisory committee and has been invaluable in assembled the panel you will hear from today. So, now, let me turn the podium to Shay.

SHAY BILCHIK: Good morning. It is great to see a room filled with people who care about this nation's children and youth, who care about a strong social justice agenda for those children and youth, and who understand the importance of having this conversation around the role of philanthropy and the role of the nonprofit sector and the relationship between the two of them in achieving that better social agenda around our children and youth.

I'm delighted to be partnering with Kathy in this work. She is a wonderful colleague. One of the bright spots of my time at Georgetown has been developing a working relationship between our Center for Juvenile Justice Reform and her Center for Public and Nonprofit Leadership. I would be remiss not to recognize Bill Gormley, dean of the Georgetown Public Policy Institute, who also has been incredibly supportive of the work that we have undertaken at GPPI around this set of issues.

I hope that the time we spent together today will surfacing important issues related to the role that the philanthropic and nonprofit communities must play in advancing a strong social justice agenda for

children and youth -- and also raise and examine the tough issues that must be answered around the responsibilities these two communities have to one another and the populations they seek to support.

We have framed a portion of today's discussion around the four key approaches that the philanthropic community uses to partner with the nonprofit sector: support for infrastructure, support for advocacy, support for experimentation and innovation, and support for replication. As we look at the goals and strategies of foundations interested in social justice issues related to children and youth, and compare them to the goals, needs and strategies of the nonprofit organizations that share that interest, we find the proverbial rub - we see some tension begin to develop as we come together around supporting our children and youth.

In a world of dwindling resources and increasing need, we find the difficulties associated with this alignment complicated by foundations and other funders, including the public sector, demanding more accountability. We should not be afraid of accountability - accountability for resources being used as intended and accountability for outcomes that are achieved with efficiency. But perhaps there is less room for error and experimentation. Replication of effective practices may take greater precedence over experimentation and innovation, which can lead to new ideas and future evidence-based practices around the country.

Where does infrastructure support fit into this equation, when the nonprofit provider is increasingly viewed as a contractor "hired" to help the foundation carry out its goals rather than a key player in the field who needs a variety of supports to survive? What about support for advocacy efforts undertaken by the nonprofit sector? How should the philanthropic community be supporting advocacy? Can it support advocacy within its charters, within the provisions of the federal law, and to what degree? How should philanthropy balance support for direct services with activities geared more toward system and policy change?

These are some of the issues that we will explore in this forum today. I think they are fundamental to the survival of what has predominantly been a strong partnership between these two sectors in supporting a social justice agenda for children and youth in this country. I hope today's discussion leaves us better prepared to keep our bearings and maintain our balance on this very difficult path.

I am delighted - absolutely delighted - to have with us as our keynote speaker William Bell who is president and CEO of Casey Family Programs.

As many of you know, Casey Family Programs is the country's largest national operating foundation with a mission focused solely on providing, improving and ultimately preventing the need for foster care. As a leader for youth who has been intimately involved in public, nonprofit and philanthropic organizations, Mr. Bell brings tremendous experience in a variety of perspectives. You also should know that he is passionate and relentless in his desire to help some of our most challenged young people achieve a sense of well-being and permanence and safety in their lives.

WILLIAM C. BELL: Good morning. Let me start by thanking Shay and Kathy and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform in Georgetown Law Center for inviting me to speak with you this morning on a subject that has been a part of my professional life for something approaching 30 years.

The connections between social justice for children and foster care and the circumstances that put our children at risk of being in foster care are indeed profound, and I come at this from a number of different perspectives.

As a child of the `50s and `60s in rural Mississippi, it was painfully evident to me that somehow, the opportunities that were afforded to other children were missing from my world. That raised a number of questions for me, mainly "Why? Why can't I? Don't I feel? Don't I cry? Don't I need? Am I not the same?"

In the early 1980s, I was a young caseworker in New York City working in a foster care and child abuse prevention program. At the point that I arrived there, I had considered a path of medicine; I planned to be a renowned doctor helping to mend bodies and yet I found myself in a place where I was being called upon to mend hearts, to mend minds, to mend relationships, to help people to think differently.

Later, I was a commissioner of child welfare in New York, one of the toughest cities in the world, a city where not everybody believed that the people we were seeking to serve, the people we were seeking to lift up, deserved to be served, deserved to be lifted up. It raised for me the question of who we had become as a society in this great nation that we call America - who are we.

Finally, I come at this from the perspective of a CEO in an operating foundation in philanthropy - a place where I have made many new friends. And I come at this also from the perspective of a board member of a grantmaking foundation, the Marguerite Casey Foundation.

Melding all of those perspectives drives me to ask myself some questions. What role do I play as a member of philanthropy? What role does William Bell play? What role does that little boy from Mississippi play in pushing this conversation on social justice, which is different in different minds?

And not only do I question myself, I question this country, question the intent of so many different institutions. But never do I question the desire of one who does not perceive himself as having justice to have justice, even though he may not fully comprehend what that really is. He does understand that it is something that he has yet to attain.

Probably because of its independent and well-financed (well-financed before last October) nature, philanthropy has been deemed to be uniquely positioned to lead this conversation around advancement of a civil society, advancement a more just society, advancement of a society that is better for all of us.

There are some key considerations that every philanthropic organization must focus on if it is going to carry out that charge. One is having strong partnerships with the nonprofit sector to meet the challenges of experimentation and replication of innovative strategies.

At Casey Family Programs, we have come to realize that, as much as we want to see a different foster care situation in this country, as much as we want to see children given the opportunity to succeed even when they cannot be raised by their own parents, we cannot do that by ourselves. Even though we could finance it, it would not be prudent to finance that in isolation.

For many years, we at Casey Family Programs operated in isolation. We run direct foster care for long-term foster care purposes and, in our own minds, we were the best. Then we stepped back to look at the outcomes of those children that we had been the best at caring for, and what we learned was staggering. While their outcomes in adulthood might have been slightly better than those of

children coming from public welfare systems, they were not what we would have intended with all of the investments that we were making in the lives of those children. We realized we needed to step back and rethink who we thought we were. We began to understand that if we do not approach this work from a collective perspective, we are not going to be successful no matter how many resources we may have.

No matter how long and storied our history might be, we all - not just philanthropy but not-for-profit and all of our interested stakeholders - need to take a step back and ask ourselves the question: Who do we think we are, what do we think that we are doing, and what do the results say about what we think?

At the same time, we must maintain an unwavering grounding in the values and the principles that describe who we are. When your actions and your values are in line, the results demonstrate that. We are great at identifying these huge value propositions that elevate the importance of what we say, but I want us to keep pushing for an answer to the question: "but what are we doing." We need to, as philanthropy, continue to have a clear grounding in the original intent of the entrepreneurs who funded us.

I think about the late Jim Casey - the founder of UPS - who is also the founder of Casey Family Programs and the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and Casey Family Programs founded the Marguerite Casey Foundation. Here was a gentleman who had obtained riches beyond his wildest imagination and yet looked at those around him and said, "Something is different about their opportunities and my opportunities and I need to do something to change that."

At Casey Family Programs, after years of moving in what we thought was our intended direction, we realized we were not being entrepreneurial enough. And that - an entrepreneur - was who Jim Casey was, someone who innovated and changed based on market conditions, someone who understood what was going on in his environment and made the necessary adjustments to continue to be relevant.

We each need to take a step back and ask ourselves, "Are we relevant? Are we having the impact that we desire to have?" And we must be willing to accept the answers, and have the courage to stand - and sometimes stand apart - when it becomes necessary. But even when we are standing apart, we must stand with others, because none of us will ever be able to achieve these lofty ideals of social justice alone.

True social justice for all members of this great nation - is it really possible?

I believe in Casey Family Programs and I believe that, not only is this possible, it is absolutely necessary if we are going to live at peace in this nation, at peace with ourselves, at peace with the communities that surround us, and at peace with this world.

If there are communities in this nation that are left behind - left out - and not included in change and improvement, but yet my community is safe, my community has 24-hour protection, my community is treated with respect by the officer who drives by, How can we be at peace?

The Preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America spells out the legal framework under which our federal government exists to serve the people it governs. It ordains and establishes that we the people - all of us - must establish justice, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty not only for ourselves but for those who come after us.

The focus was on creating a nation that would be better than it was at that time and that would continue to improve, and that betterment rests at least in part in justice, general welfare, and the blessings of opportunities that we offer to those who follow us.

In the Pledge of Allegiance, written in 1892, we pledge allegiance to the flag of an America that was one nation, where liberty and justice were the hope of all citizens, were achievable by all citizens. I ask you: is that the America that you live in? Is that the America that you are seeking to see in your lifetime?

Justice for all - a core ideal of our democratic philosophy - should be the driving force in all that we do. Yet I know 500,000 children who do not believe that this justice applies to them. I know another 300,000 children who spend their days wondering, "What happened to me?"

Not unlike me growing up in rural Mississippi in the late 1950s. Now that I have achieved this place in my career, what do I do? What is my role? What do I think, what do I live, what do I breathe in order to ensure that this justice is made available to this vulnerable population? What must my colleagues in philanthropy do?

One of the first things that we must do is ensure that government fulfills its role.

When you sit on a significant amount of resources, as many of my colleagues do, you might seek to replace government, thinking "We can do it better. We can build a parallel system. We need to build a counter system to move forward."

But that is not the role of philanthropy. That is not the role of the not-for-profit.

We in philanthropy need to understand that we do not exist to take our brilliant thinking and change the worlds of people. We exist to help people change their own worlds.

We need to engage those whom we say we seek to help in determining what type of help they really need, and enable them to understand that they, themselves, can lead the charge to change the social condition, if given the opportunity to do so.

Philanthropy must be a convener - must use its convening power. We can say, "Will you 15 people come to Seattle?" And they will come. We can make that happen. How are we using this power? How are we choosing to influence discussions about needed public policy?

There is a song from the Civil Rights Movement that said, "He who believes in freedom cannot rest until it comes." If we, in philanthropy, really believe in justice for all, are we resting? And why are we resting? Do we believe that it has come? Do we believe that the representation of Barack Obama in the White House means that justice for all has come? Do we believe that what used to exist when William Bell was a little boy in Mississippi somehow no longer exists in this nation? Do we believe that we are far beyond that time when there were some people who were left out? Does "We, the people..." not necessarily mean, "we, the homeless..." "we, the abused children..." "we, the incarcerated juveniles...?"

Philanthropy must lead the charge to promote that we, the people, means all of our children. America must take on the responsibility of ensuring that every one of its children has the opportunity for social justice.

Engaging in the public policy debate is not something new for philanthropy. If we look back historically, the emergency medical system that we have today is directly connected to the work

done by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation has had an enormous impact on health care policy in this country. But America's receptivity to an improved emergency medical system or health care system is quite different from its receptivity to sharing justice with some of these vulnerable populations. And I would suggest that is because of issues of gender, race and ethnicity, and economics. We are talking about a population that is largely female adults, largely of color and poor.

And so, the question becomes, is America ready to open the doors of justice to this population? Is America ready to say there is no child who will be allowed to suffer in poverty in the richest nation in the world? If it is not, then what is our role and what is our responsibility?

If government is not carrying out the charge that we, the people, have elected it to carry out, we, the people, have an obligation to intervene and move government to act in the way we elected them to act. That is the thing called advocacy.

Today, we face a shrinking economic base, and that is a huge challenge. Once the economic base starts to shrink, those necessary partners of government, philanthropy, not-for-profit and communities often find themselves in conflict, not because we do not still share common goals, but because survival mode has kicked in. When survival mode kicks in, philanthropy tends to seek more accountability for those scarce resources, and nonprofits expect philanthropy to increase its investment - "I am your arm in the community" - and government feels pressure to cut its budget - "I have to let go of the safety net because I cannot afford to keep it going" - and we end up fighting over something quite different than what we intended to deal with, which was social justice.

Philanthropy must step up. This is a time to do more even though it is painful, lest we lose the progress we have begun to make. Philanthropy must be the convener, it must partner with all of these sectors, and it must be the voice that elevates the needs of people.

Philanthropy must begin to think about an integrated response to the issues we face. By that I mean moving away from our historical, siloed responses and come together to do work together.

Look at the philanthropic response to Hurricane Katrina and the rebuilding effort that followed. While a long list of foundations and nonprofits and others contributed to the rebuilding of New Orleans, spending millions of dollars, the reality is the 9th Ward still is not rebuilt. There are still children and adults separated and living across this country and not in their homes in New Orleans. If philanthropy had taken an integrated response to Katrina, how might things be different? What if the leaders of the foundations interested in that rebuilding effort had walked in together and said, "Government of New Orleans, government of Louisiana, FEMA, sit down with us and we want to say to you that we have X millions of dollars for housing, we have X million of dollars for education, we have X million of dollars for bringing people back home and we have X millions of dollars for these other five areas, how can we collectively use these resources to have a stronger, more permanent response to the issues that have been created for us by Katrina?"

If we in philanthropy are willing to move beyond those walls that separate us into an integrated conversation about how we will collectively change the opportunities for all children in America, I believe that we will end up in a far better place.

At margueritecasey.org, you will see our mission. It is to create a movement of working founders advocating on their own behalf for change. Advocacy is the mission, supporting and nurturing strong vibrant activism within and among families, enabling them to advocate for their own interest;

examining, changing and informing the investment of social and economic policies and practices that promote the development of strong families and strong communities; encouraging the development of a coherent knowledge base for advocates, families and other organizations that they serve; investing in systems change and across systems change in order to generate knowledge and provide effective working models for practice.

That is who we say we are. We live that out by funding infrastructure. We live that out by making sure that our grantees are people who are engaged in ensuring that the voices of the people are being elevated, not the voices of the not-for-profit but the voices of the people, and that people are being prepared to actively engage in changing their own futures.

Last September, we convened 10,000 families in a campaign in Birmingham, Alabama, Chicago, Illinois and Los Angeles, California. The purpose was to have the families ratify a platform stating what government needs to do to help them change their economic condition. Recently, some of those families were on Capitol Hill talking to elected officials, demanding change. Someone once said that power concedes nothing without a demand. It is our role - mine and philanthropy's and the not-for-profit sector's and students' and community members' - to begin to open the doors so that our children, those who come after us, can truly receive justice.

I'm reminded of Dr. King speaking to a crowd in Chicago in 1968 shortly before his death. He said he was tired of marching for something that should have been his at birth. We all get tired of fighting sometimes. But while Dr. King said he was weary, he kept on marching. He knew that he could not let up, that the price would be too great, the price is too high.

Today, the price remains too high, when 800,000 of our vulnerable children travel through our child welfare system every year. The price is too high when 1.3 million juveniles are arrested each year. The price is too high when 900,000 teenagers in this country become pregnant every year. The price is too high when a young man born today, just because he is born into a certain family, in a certain ZIP code, in a certain neighborhood in this country is more than twice as likely to be incarcerated in his lifetime than a young man born in a different family, in a different ZIP code, in a different neighborhood.

Warren Buffett, the investment wizard and philanthropist, said, "Someone is sitting in the shade today because someone planted a tree a long time ago."

That is the role of philanthropy in public policy. Planting trees of justice, planting trees of policy change so that someone who is not yet born will one day be able to bask in the shade of a changed America. Because we were willing to stand, because we were willing to stand apart, because we were willing to stand together.

God bless you and thank you for listening.

SHAY BILCHIK: Thank you, William, for those wonderful comments. Your thoughts on standing together and serving as a convener, as a partner, and not imposing will begins the conversation on advocacy, the role of the public sector and the idea of an integrated response from the philanthropic community, and how we get to not just an integrated response from the philanthropic world but from the public sector and the nonprofit world together.

Some of you may have seen in our original materials promoting this event that Robert Crane, president of the JEHT Foundation, would be on our panel today. As many of you know, the JEHT Foundation learned that their main funder had invested all of their funds in the Madoff funds, and the foundation was forced to close. Despite that, Robert had agreed to join our panel. However, he subsequently contracted pneumonia, as a result, is unable to be with us today.

Let me introduce our panelists.

First is Sarah Brown, CEO of the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy - a nonprofit organization in Washington, D.C., that stimulates and supports actions nationwide to reduce adolescent and unplanned pregnancy.

Next in order, is Lori Kaplan, executive director of the Latin American Youth Center, which provides comprehensive, multilingual and culturally sensitive programs, support in education, employment, social services, advocacy and social enterprise for youth and families in Washington, D.C., and Maryland.

Then, Sherry Magill, president of the Jessie Ball duPont Fund, one of the nation's pre-eminent philanthropic foundations headquartered in Jacksonville, Florida. As a partner in the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, she has supported our efforts to strengthen the leadership within the public sector and deepen their ability to reform their juvenile justice systems. She also has been a long-time supporter of the Center for Public and Nonprofit Leadership.

Finally, Marvin Ventrell, former president/CEO of the National Association of Counsel for Children (NACC), a child advocacy and professional membership, nonprofit organization headquartered in Denver, Colorado. NACC is dedicated to providing high quality legal services to children through training and technical assistance as well as through advocacy.

Each panelist will share thoughts about the relationship between foundations and nonprofits in supporting that strong social agenda for children and youth, and supporting each other in this work.

SARAH BROWN: Thank you, Shay. I want to focus on those issues that arise in policy work that is funded by philanthropies and carried out by nonprofits, by the grantees.

I understand that a lot of philanthropies struggle with this choice - do I fund direct services or do I fund advocacy policy work? I think this tension has only gotten greater with the economic downturn, where the need for more work at both levels is acute.

Do you do 30,000-foot work or do you work on real programs for real people? Some foundations have feet in both camps. Some foundations go back and forth. I think a happy medium might be a philanthropic portfolio that does a little bit of both. It funds advocacy. It funds policy work. And its direct services investments are closely tied to those for learning, for research, for getting real voices and real people attached to the more abstract policy discussions.

There are three points I wish to make. And understand that my views are based on running a nonprofit supported largely by private foundations. We offer no direct services at all. We have a strong public policy arm, and we provide extensive assistance and guidance to program leaders. We do research, of course, and associated functions.

Issue number one: I think it can be very challenging for philanthropies and grantees to fully align themselves on complex policy issues. They may agree on the big picture but not on the details. And given that hard-hitting policy work involves a lot of details and strategy, this can create tension between the parties. Imagine, for example, that you are an advocacy group that gets funding from five major philanthropies who have a slightly different take on a complex policy issue. You publish a policy brief that has real teeth and you develop testimony that speaks with real specificity. The chances that your positions are going to be in perfect sync with all of your funders are slim, even though you agree on the broad points. So, the more specific a foundation is about what policy it wants its grantees to pursue or advocate for, the more directive it is going to be, which makes it harder for even most competent grantees to fall in line.

Issue number two: philanthropies increasingly want clear evidence that their grantees are effective in their work. Foundation boards often ask program directors for such evidence and they often want it in some detail. Many foundations now ask for clear cost-benefit metrics. They use expected-return analysis or other similar things to decide who is going to be funded. In much the same way, the boards of nonprofits are increasingly evidence focused. They ask for logic models, for theories of change, for performance measures - it is results, results, results.

The problem is that results are often - though not always - hard to track in the sausage-making world of policy. How can advocacy group A prove that its brilliant analysis of issue X made a key member of the Senate Finance Committee vote a certain way? How can advocacy group B demonstrate that its series of briefings on the Hill increased the interest of legislative staff in a particular aspect of the problem?

This is further complicated by the fact that a lot of the most sensitive policy work occurs quietly, behind closed doors, *sotto voce*, and is a dance that nobody wants to talk about. How do you count this work? If you want to take credit, how much do you take and on what basis?

What are the outcome metrics and measures that foundations should require or nonprofits use to assess the value and results of their policy work? In many direct service programs, the metrics are clearer - not easy, I understand, but a bit more clear: number served, client retention, graduation rates, health status, maybe even test scores. But in policy, if one is honest, it is a bit risky to take direct credit for progress. On the one hand, backbiting from your colleague organizations will start immediately if you are too puffed up. On the other hand, if you are too modest, your star may sink toward the horizon because other groups are better salespeople.

It can be harder to judge the results of policy work than some direct service work.

Issue number three: the tension between world views - the strategic framework of foundations versus that of potential grantees. The more foundations set their parameters, goals, strategies, performance measures and metrics, the less room there is for them to meet, understand and fund groups that perhaps take a different view of an issue, or frame it a different way.

I worry that as foundations become more organized, clearer in their goals, more accountable to their boards, more buttoned up, the less likely it is that outlier issues and entrepreneurial groups may find the funding source. Unless there is a clear set-aside for innovation, we may all get frozen in the current ways of thinking.

Let me give you an example. When the National Campaign began in the 1990s with an exclusive focus on preventing teen pregnancy, we said on day one that our goal was to improve the lives of children

and families. In fact, our mission statement at the time began by saying the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy seeks to improve the lives and future prospects of children and families and, in particular, to reduce child poverty... Our specific strategy is to prevent teen pregnancy.

We approached funders who work with children and family issues and said, "We want to talk to you about our work - reducing teen pregnancy - because we think it is one of the most powerful single interventions to reduce child poverty, improve the life of children and families." And the funder would say: "Yeah, teen pregnancy, oh yeah, we have a reproductive health program so why don't you go over there?" It was very difficult to get funders to see the work in the frame improving the lives of children and families. Now this all has worked out over time. We have been successful. But it was a wake-up call to me about how frames can stifle different approaches.

LORI KAPLAN: Thank you so much. I'm so happy to be here.

Let me share a very short story. In 1968, the Latin American Youth Center was born, and it is not a coincidence that it was born the year Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated. It was born in a neighborhood that burned down as a result of his assassination. Out of those flames the seeds were planted, and out of his vision and the vision of some very politically progressive Latinos, the youth center was born. It was born with a spirit of advocacy. It was a group of young people in a neighborhood who took over a building and said "we need to get something going here for this generation of young immigrants who have come into this community."

Now, there was not a whole body of youth development research at that time. There was not a lot of nonprofit infrastructure at that time - it was 40 years ago. It was quite different. In 1979, I wandered in. I was a baby boomer and I met the former executive director and I thought, "Oh, this looks fun. Can I help?" He said, "Sure, you can volunteer. You can be a volunteer." We had no money. So, I started volunteering. That was 30 years ago.

The vision that brought us all together - from the inception - was a vision of social justice for young people in a neighborhood that had been destroyed as a result of riots in 1968. An underlying core value of our work always has been that all children and youth should have the same rights.

Now, let me move to a different topic.

I think my job on this panel is to bring the conversation down to reality, into the trenches and the neighborhoods. My comments today are quite different than they might have been three months ago, six months ago, or a year ago.

A sobering fact: 100,000 nonprofits probably will close in the next year, according to Dr. Alice Rivlin [former director of the Congressional Budget Office and expert on fiscal, monetary and social policy]. These are the groups that feed the hungry, clothe people, shelter the homeless. Many of us are consumers of nonprofits. I do not know about you, but I have had to use hospice care. My dad lives in a residential facility. Once you become a consumer, it changes your understanding of the sector.

As executive director of the youth center, I do not remember a time when this work was easy. I do not remember a time when the lives of the children and youth with whom we work were easy. The kids who come to the youth center everyday are not walking around singing the blues about the stock market. They are bouncing into the youth center saying, "I want to go to college. I want to get that

GED.” All the same things they wanted a year ago, they still want, but our reality has significantly changed.

The current situation has made me acutely aware of the vulnerability of the nonprofit sector. It will compel philanthropies to change their approach to giving. Many nonprofit leaders are saying, “Hey, give more. You do not have to stick with this 5 percent [payout] and give it quickly. Get your money out the door.” There is not a lot of time for strategic planning and endless conversations about policy agendas that may happen down the road.

The Latin American Youth Center’s success has been due to our flexibility in the face of changing trends in philanthropy.

When I first started, everyone in philanthropy would say to me, “Your organization is way too small. And who else is giving you money?” This was 30 years ago. So I went knocking on everybody’s door and found that first foundation to give us money. Then I could say “They are giving us money,” and another philanthropy would say, “Okay, we will, too.”

Then we conducted a capital campaign, we built a building. Philanthropy said, “Oh, you are too big. You do not look like you need our money anymore.” And I said, “Why do kids who are low-income have to be served in dank, nasty basements, in crumbling schools, in overcrowded housing?” We expect them to realize the social justice dreams that William just referred to.

Then there was the trend where philanthropies would only fund program and not infrastructure. I would come back to work and say, “Okay folks, if we are going to get their money, we have to fix the language and put it into a program.” We did that.

Then there was a trend where we were accused of having way too many programs. What are you going to cut? I would smile and say, “We are multi-service. What do you think we should cut?”

Then there was the trend of investment philanthropy. We received funding to do a strategic plan, we received an investment of capacity. The train was leaving the station on outcomes and evaluation and we got on that train. Some of it was about scaling up, some of it was about replicability. I remember a conversation about advocacy and it was exactly as Sarah described it: People asked me, “Why are you doing advocacy and how are you going to measure it?” And I would say, “You know what? Without advocacy, we will go down the drain.”

That is my measure of success. The moment we let go of our advocacy work, the moment we stop believing in social justice and policy and think that this is just about that one child going to college, we will not survive this period.

The current trends need to be suspended. We are in a crisis moment. We need to keep the organizations out there feeding the hungry, housing the poor, keep them strong, stable, and enable them to stay the course. Advocacy is the underpinning of that.

I had not expected that government and corporations and nonprofits would all be at odds. That was a sobering thought. I think we are all in this together and we are all going to have to figure this out together.

For me, the silver lining in this crisis is that it is changing the rules of engagement between nonprofits and philanthropy. There is an openness of communication and transparency that I have not experienced before. Funders are calling and saying “How are you doing?” I’m calling funders and

saying, "This is what the deal is right now. These are our contingency plans if we do not meet our budget goals. These are the steps we are going to take." They say, "How can we help?"

I feel there will be a circling of the wagons among the larger, stronger nonprofits that can stay the course and see their way through these challenging times. We are one of those, so that makes me happy. But it also makes me sad because, 40 years ago, we were a small, volunteer collection of entrepreneurs, social activists and baby boomers.

SHERRY P. MAGILL: I do not know if I'm happy to be here or not because I represent a private independent grantmaker, but thank you, Shay, for the invitation and thank you, Sarah and Lori, for those remarks.

I want to talk about the need to sustain the effort to engage the public in the formation of public policies, and why it is difficult for foundations to do this work.

At the outset, I need to share a bit about the foundation for which I work, because none of us belongs to a monolithic field. We all are fairly individualistic and we are idiosyncratic, and it has everything to do with who founded these entities.

In our case, Jessie Ball duPont founded the Jessie Ball duPont Religious, Charitable and Educational Fund. Under her will, we are literally a trust. She decided that the trust should exist in perpetuity, the Senate Finance Committee notwithstanding. And she restricted the giving of the foundation in perpetuity to organizations that she supported in the early 1960s. These are old organizations because they had to be around in the early 1960s. They are fairly well-established in most cases. There are about 330 of them and they run the gamut from Georgetown University and 84 other academic institutions to two all volunteer rescue squads in the Northern Neck of Virginia. There are about 150 traditional 501(c)3s; those include hospitals, historic preservation societies, youth-serving organizations, American Red Crosses, Boys and Girls Clubs, and about 85 churches and eight religious judicatories, making the fund one of the largest religion grantmakers by definition in the country.

The point is we have a diverse list of grantees. We are not required to fund them but these are the only organizations that we may fund. Ironically, our grantmaking has created organizations that we cannot fund directly because we do a lot of partnership grants. It is kind of odd for the Jessie Ball duPont Fund, given our set of restrictions, to be engaged in helping the formation of good public policies, and I refer more to supporting public engagement in the policymaking process than to creating and supporting certain public policies.

We have a history of doing this kind of work at the state and local levels in Florida. And even though we fund all over the country, mostly in the Southeast, most of our public engagement work is located locally, partly because we do not play at the federal level, partly because a hundred organizations that we may support are located in Florida, and partly because we are located there, we know the players, we know the issues, we know who wants to do this work, and who does not want to do this work.

We fund mostly research, dissemination of research through publications, community meetings and news outlets. We fund nonprofit organizations that want to do advocacy work, nonprofit organizations that want to move the research around certain public policies - especially around

juvenile justice policies - out into the public discourse and help mobilize the public to advocate on its own behalf. We are interested in pragmatic public policies, for wise expenditure of the public's dollars, for things that, quite frankly, make sense to help kids, to stop growing a prison population, to stop expanding prisons, et cetera, et cetera.

We have also been involved with Medicaid reform issues in Florida, which Georgetown University's researchers helped us with, as well as trying to work on policies that promote building the asset development for low-wealth and low-income communities. So we are not involved in every single policy one can imagine. It is fairly targeted, based on what eligible organizations are equipped to do.

You may think a foundation is a foundation is a foundation; if you have met a foundation, you have met a foundation. I react negatively to notions about trends in the foundation field, the idea that "all foundations treat me this way." Quite frankly, it has not been my experience, and I have not always been a grantmaker. I used to work in higher education and wrote proposals myself.

Let me tell you about the duPont Fund's involvement in juvenile justice reform issues in Florida. I think it explains what we do and why we do it and why we think it is important.

We came to public engagement in policy formation by having made some grants to a national organization, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, to study the expansion of prisons and the growth in Florida's prison population. These grants were made in the late 1980s and completed around '91, '92. The findings were pretty sobering. The studies showed that if Florida did not stop doing what Florida was doing, that within a short period of time we would be spending more money on our adult prison population than we would be spending on kids enrolled at the state public universities and colleges, and eventually we could not sustain both systems, we would not be able to sustain a higher education system and a prison system.

Sadly, the predictions came true. Being the funder who funded the research, I learned a lot about what we did not do that we needed to learn how to do and how to fund. Specifically, we needed to learn how to move those studies out into the public discourse so that the public could organize around the findings and demand, as William says, something different.

That body of work led to our interest in juvenile justice reform. The question became, "How do we stop growing an adult prison population?" Obviously, one must invest in the education and well being of the next generation so that they have meaningful work to do, that they can be engaged in a productive life, that they can be engaged citizens in this democratic experiment. It is a logical extension of those early, early studies.

Segue forward several years... We had funded a lot of studies around what was broken in Florida's juvenile justice system, but we needed to fund organizations whose mission it was to do advocacy work. I do not think you can take organizations that are direct service providers and make them into advocacy organizations if that is not what they choose to do.

Shay Bilchik had left OJJDP and gone to Child Welfare League of America, which we may fund. They got involved with the research from NCCD and they found a Florida-based partner that is, by definition and by mission, an advocacy organization. They did, over a couple of years, an enormous body of work mobilizing people in local communities and mobilizing children and parents who benefit from direct services of nonprofits.

They brought thousands of people to Tallahassee to demonstrate for continued funding of nonprofit services, prevention and intervention services for kids, to prevent them from falling into the juvenile justice system and on the foster care side. During the Jeb Bush era - when the state was fat and had a lot of money - the state was nevertheless cutting taxes and cutting programs, and they saved almost \$80 million worth of funding for organizations.

Our outcome measure did not have anything to do with "did this kid get a college degree?" It really was pretty simple: are we going to continue to put state public money into these organizations? We did not have a lot of sophisticated accountability tools. What we had was incredibly successful work.

As a foundation, we learned an enormous amount about what we could fund that had the potential to be successful, what that model looks like. And the model is broad, and involves helping organizations that know that they must advocate because they receive state and local public dollars. They cannot just provide a direct service. They have to get involved in advocacy to save their own programs. They have to be willing to mobilize their constituent groups. They have to be willing to go to the state house. They have to be willing to meet state and local elected and appointed officials and make their case. And they have to do it over and over and over and over because the smart people are not in public office. And those who are do not stay there very long.

It is not easy for foundations to do this work. We are not monolithic. We spend less time talking to one another than folks understand. We do say, "Who else is funding your work," because we know that we cannot be the 100-percent funder, because we are worried that the work will fail.

Funding the research is the easy part for us. Finding those allies who want to do the advocacy work, finding the foundation allies, is very, very challenging. I cannot name five foundations based in Florida that fund advocacy in Florida. It is a daunting challenge.

And you are quite right about the tension between funding direct service and funding public engagement and advocacy.

I'll just say this final word about where we find ourselves and I, too, think it is pretty sobering.

Foundations have lost a third of their assets. Just take what you knew in September and divide it by three and lop off a third. We have fewer financial resources than we had six months ago. Foundation trustees have multiple responsibilities. A fiduciary responsibility to a perpetual foundation is a serious legal obligation. In our case, I'm happy to say our trustees decided that we would overspend the 5 percent [payout]. We have set a grants budget that was 6 percent of our assets but our assets continue to drop so it is probably going to look more like 7.

We are stepping up to the plate, at least in Florida, to try to shore up nonprofits that feed people. There is a new population - I think you all know - that is eating at the nation's homeless shelters because that is how they are making ends meet. Their income has dropped they are making ends meet by eating at places that will give them a free meal so that they can continue to pay the rent or the mortgage or whatever it is they need to pay. We created a \$1.5 million fund called the 90-Day Social Safety Net Fund at The Community Foundation in Jacksonville. The 90 days are almost up. I'm very worried about it because we are only supporting 14 downtown organizations that are serving people they have never seen before.

Our communications consultant asked me, "So, what is the next step?" And honestly, I do not know. We cannot do any strategic planning around it - you are quite right about that. I think, in part, the

next step is going back to the basics of advocacy. Our local City Council and our state Legislature must come to understand the pain that Floridians are experiencing and who feeds them, and that this is a nonprofit system that feeds them and, if it collapses, all bets are off. We cannot afford for our homeless shelters to collapse.

I promise you, this is not the kind of grantmaking I like to do. I like to look 20 years out. What must we invest in today so things look different in 20 years? But I agree wholeheartedly that, somehow, foundations must try hard to meet this enormous need in a short period of time, knowing full well we cannot fill those holes. But as we do that, I think we would make a colossal mistake if we did not insist on the other half of the equation - and that is advocacy, advocacy, advocacy, advocacy.

Even if we are talking about feeding people, it is advocacy, because we cannot do this without federal help and we cannot do it without state help. The taxpayer must step up to this challenge. And William, I think that is part of our job.

MARVIN R. VENTRELL: I have been raising money in juvenile justice and child welfare for 25 years and I have never been part of a discussion like this.

Let me follow up initially on the comments about what can appear as roadblocks to funding through foundation infrastructure. I come at this entirely from the beggar's perspective. I have experienced every one of those trends, and I have experienced them over and over again. You frequently feel like you are always in the wrong place at the wrong time. It can create a real danger for the association because we find ourselves straying from our mission in order to go where the money is.

I have never been an RFP chaser. Yet I see that often in my business. An RFP comes out and someone will say, "Well, we have people who could do that. I could figure out how to do that." But where in the strategic plan does it say that you should do that? We should be able to go to foundations with a good idea and show the efficacy of that idea and be successful at getting funding.

One of the issues I have heard today is the notion of collaboration - governmental, foundation and service provider collaboration, with overarching policy goals. In my business, for example, in child welfare, we have a government superstructure that says the goal of the system is safety, permanence and well-being. We have the three-prong search for safety, permanence and well-being. If the government is recognizing that, and Casey is recognizing that and the NACC and the Child Welfare League and whoever else is recognizing that, then we are all on the same page. We become multiple sources of funding.

Let me suggest that that line between direct service and policy advocacy, if you will, is a much grayer line, not a bright line, than we often think.

Look at the article that Kathy wrote titled, "Philanthropy in Public Policy: Not Why, But Why Not?" Chew on that title for a minute until you can taste it. I think it is quite clever. It seems very simple. But I go to a funder and for what is traditionally described as a policy advocacy issue, only to be asked why they should fund policy? I would like to respond, "Why not?" Why is there a presumption against policy funding? The presumption should be the other way around. To assume that there is a hurdle to overcome, to assume that it is somehow less effective or further removed from what we traditionally define as direct service, I think, misses the point.

I do what I do largely because of the work of child abuse and neglect pioneers throughout the 20th century but perhaps most notably, the work of Dr. Henry Kempe in the 1950s. Henry Kempe published an article in 1962 called, "The Battered Child Syndrome." He had done research, scientific research, evidence-based research, in Denver General Hospital in the late '50s and early '60s that began to record an incidence of child injuries that did not correlate to the histories that were given - rolling off a couch and fracturing your skull on the carpet, for example. He published his paper and opened the Kempe Center and began treating children one at a time with their families. Within one year, Henry Kempe, a physician, went to Congress and urged the passing - successfully - of the first Mandatory Child Abuse Reporting Law. He did not see himself, as I understand it, as doing direct service on Tuesday and policy work on Wednesday. Those things were intrinsically united in the work. When we separate them, I think we make a serious mistake.

We all have heard, but I'll repeat it anyway, the wonderful tale of the two fishermen who were fishing one day and they see a baby floating down the river and they are alarmed. The fisherman runs out to save the baby and brings the baby back. Moments later, another baby comes floating down the stream and the other fisherman runs out and saves the baby and brings it back. And this continues on and on until one of the fishermen begins to run upstream. His friend says, "Where are you going?" He replies, "I'm going upstream to find out who is throwing out all these babies!" That is policy advocacy. They could not solve the problem one baby at a time.

The NACC was founded more than 30 years ago. About six years ago, we went to the Health and Human Services' Children's Bureau here in D.C. and proposed developing a program to certify lawyers as specialists in child welfare law as a means of promoting the profession, raising the level of practice, promoting the placement of attorneys in these cases to provide better representation, to produce better outcomes. We also went to private funders. We considered charging lawyers for this program to generate program revenue. We had to create the program from whole cloth. What is the curriculum going to look like? What is the test going to look like? What are the requirements going to look like? What is the administrative structure going to look like? We built it, we experimented with it. We picked several pilot states and certified lawyers in three pilot states. We then took the data from those pilot states, evaluated it, reformed it, improved it and replicated it in other jurisdictions.

In order to get that funding, in order to get the program to go forward, each state has to buy into the program. That is the advocacy piece. We have to go to the states and convince each state that this program makes sense. (It is up and running in about 10 states now.) I would argue the program provides direct service. We are providing direct service to those attorneys, with a socially valuable goal. To piece out which piece is advocacy and which is direct service is, at best, an academic exercise.

I hope this discussion helps us recognize that what we sometimes think of as a bright line between advocacy and direct service is really not much of a line at all.

BILCHIK: I want to explore some of the things that have come up today. Let me raise a few observations.

Marvin spoke of the RFP-chaser mentality. How many of you in the room have been a nonprofit worker who has looked at an RFP and said, "You know, it does not quite match on all fours with what we are about but maybe we can tweak the four corners of what we do in a way that makes it works

for us?" Having been a funder at the Justice Department, I know the flip side of that: watching organizations reinvent themselves in order to match up with what we wanted to do, and worrying that we would find out later that we funded an organization that was doing things that were not expecting.

At the Child Welfare League, we had an opportunity for a very sizable grant. We sat down with the prospective funder and said, "In terms of what you are looking to do, we match up about 95 percent. But we have to be honest with you, this last 5 percent you will never hear out of our mouths." The funder said, "Then we are not going to fund you." There was no room for discussion.

One final thought: though we did not have anyone directly from the public sector on this panel, I ask the question: What is the public sector role in this? Is it reasonable to expect that whoever comes in to the Children's Bureau, OJJDP and SAMSA will sit down with the philanthropic community and the nonprofit sector and say, "How do we form a triad that works on these issues and creates these integrated responses?" Is that a fair expectation?

KAPLAN: We work very closely with our public sector. That is where our advocacy work has been the strongest. Now, you have to remember most of my career has been in D.C., and we are not a state.

Our journey - because we have worked with a very disenfranchised community, a recent immigrant community, first and second generation kids - has involved very focused dialogue, whether it is with the mayor or the head of our juvenile justice system or the head of our human services system. We work with them to understand what kind of RFPs they need to issue, what kind of services they need to purchase, and where the community can provide services more effectively than government.

In our case, it was quite easy through the years. At one point, 15 percent of the city was Latino, while less than 2 percent of people who worked in government spoke Spanish. It was a very recent immigrant community. There were issues around which we could come together with government and really work together. Today, we work with African-American, Latino, Asian - all children - but I think we established a relationship where government expected us to step up and say, "Look, this is what is going on. This is what we are thinking about. How can we work together?" That public sector access has been critical.

BROWN: People go to the public sector for funding because that is where the money is. Particularly at the federal level. So, the public sector role, particularly on these very serious problems, has to be major. That is why people advocate not only on their own behalf but on behalf of the larger issues.

The old model was that the private foundations were the innovators. They would try something and once it was figured out, we would turn to the private sector or government to pick it up and take it to scale. I do not know if that model still holds.

The problem with the public sector funding is that it invariably involves politics. Now, I'm not saying private foundations do not have politics. Humans are political - they have different points of view, they argue, they debate. But my life in the public sector has been very challenging. So, as much as we may be attracted to the public sector, in some fields, on some issues you run smack into major and disabling ideological debates.

MAGILL: I find it impossible to talk about the role of philanthropy in the formation of public policy without talking about government. We continue to have this conversation in a vacuum. The big shift in this country has not been around foundations at all. It has been the debate we have been having for a long, long time about the role of government in our lives.

When I was young, the conversation about the role of government involved great society arguments and large public welfare programs. I do not mean welfare in a pejorative way. I mean it in the way that William meant it when he quoted the preamble to the constitution, the general welfare. Sputnik caused this country to say, "Hey, we need to invest in education, particularly math and science." I benefited greatly from those public dollar investments. That was a defense strategy; that was protecting democracy strategy, big national public purposes. These are not private foundation policies.

Those of us involved in funding advocacy see our audience as elected officials. It is public by definition. I hope folks continue to fight those ideological battles. They cannot say, "We are going to drop out" and assume that private individuals, private foundations will fund these needs. That is not happening.

BELL: Casey Family Programs has taken a step back to say that we need all of the dollars, regardless of their origin, invested in the change we are seeking. Now, how do we structure the conversation across these different sectors to get to that point?

I think there are four voices in the conversation. There is government's voice, there is the nonprofit's voice, there is philanthropy's voice and there is the affected community's voice. If we can get this to a dialogue about what is needed to achieve the change that we seek, then I think we can determine our respective roles, both in both funding and in the work itself.

At Casey Family Programs, we are seeking to reduce the number of children in foster care by 50 percent by the year 2020. We are not going into a state and start to make the change happen. We are going into a state and suggesting to government, "We believe this is what you were put in place to do. We have some resources that we can offer to help move that forward. But you must take the leadership role in this because that is what we have given you our tax dollars to do. And you must be accountable for spending those tax dollars. And you must own the solutions."

We can help government test potential solutions. We can help fund not-for-profit agencies to move the work forward. But, ultimately, government must be out in front, investing tax dollars, not seeking to have tax dollars supplanted by philanthropic contributions. And we must have the affected individuals engaged in determining where we need to go.

Unless we begin to push that conversation, we will stay mired in this debate over whether or not government has enough resources, which is that an excuse for doing nothing because you do not choose to put resources where they need to be.

AUDIENCE COMMENT: I must say that this has been refreshing. As someone who spent his professional life being an advocate, it is nice to have this discussion.

William talked about social justice, which is why most of us in this room do what we do. But we take pieces of it, because we think America is not quite ready to deal with large-scale social justice. That

is tied up with race, economics, money, and other scary things. So we take pieces of the issue and try to move them along.

There is a good congresswoman from Florida, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, who says elected officials can listen to an advocate like me, when I come in to make my case, but unless that official is hearing the same thing back home, it won't get traction. We need that synergy. We need the grassroots and we need the grass tops. As we think about advocacy in an integrated way, we need to remember that continuum of advocacy, how it needs to be funded, and how it needs to be mutually reinforced.

Finally let me say that I'm feeling change on the Hill. I have been doing this stuff for a long time. We are in a transformational moment. I am not sure how long it will last, and I think if the economy continues to slide and tank in some sense, it may even last longer. This guy has tremendous opportunity, and I think we have to seize the moment and think about things very differently, so we are not p---ing away all the money that we do on bad things.

AUDIENCE COMMENT: Social justice for children can only exist when there is social justice for the parents and the adults. We have a tendency to fragment the issues.

One year, there was a march in D.C. related to affordable housing. It was scheduled on a weekday. In the communities that I serve, most of the parents who needed to participate had to be at work. Of course, it was during the summer, so we decided to organize the children, educate them about the situation. They went down and acted as representatives of their parents.

We have to take a holistic perspective. With this administration, I think that may become a reality.

AUDIENCE COMMENT: My field is early childhood education. I worked for a ballot initiative in Denver that passed. It was a collaboration with the public, private and nonprofit sector, which was incredible. There now is a sales tax to support preschool. I have not heard a lot about the private sector - the issues that we are talking about really do impact business, and they need to be at the table. On the Hill, businesses are not just advocating for their own issues, they also understand the workforce issues and how child welfare and related issues impact them. It is critical to have them at the table, to have their leadership at the table.

I recently read an article about hate crimes and the growing incidence of hate groups. This concerned me because the authors expect to rise over the next couple of years. What are we going to do to ensure that we reach out and advocate and help folks understand that we do not need to attack each other?

KAPLAN: I want to go back to what was said about a transformational moment. When I hear "KKK" and we see gangs on the rise, I am reminded that we must not only hear the voices of young people, we must organize young people. We must see this administration not only succeed but thrive. We must engage young people and get them out on the street.

I work in probably the most racially diverse organization in the city with black and Latino and Asian kids. It is a joy. More and more of our kids are finding it harder to self-identify on forms. Can we seize the moment around this miraculous election, engage the voice of young people and organize

young people? They are the next set of adults. These other adults are going to age out at some point. I think that is a big piece of work that we need to look at.

BELL: There are two pieces to dealing with the question about hate crimes and people reacting violently to difference. One is dialogue, creating the space for dialogue, and one is leadership.

Foundations can create the space for the dialogue, but it requires local leadership from affected communities that is willing to push the dialogue. It is an issue that can be addressed if we are willing to confront it.

When I was in New York City as commissioner, we had 40,000 children in foster care in New York City in 1997. One out of every 10 of those children came from one community district out of 59 community districts in New York City, and that was Central Harlem. It had been that way for decades.

As commissioner, I said this cannot keep happening. I went to Central Harlem on Saturdays and in the evenings and met with the residents and said, "You cannot let me keep doing this to you." It was personal, in my view - every child who was taken, I, as commissioner, took them.

We had a conversation with the community and told them exactly what we were doing and what we were trying to do to prevent it. But we explained that the impetus for change had to come from them. In about two years, Central Harlem went from being the No. 1 placement district in the city to being No. 4, and I think now they are down around No. 7. It happened because we engaged the community in a conversation around how we were harming them.

I think that that same approach can be used to engage a community in a conversation around how a community may be harming itself. Elevating the issue to a place where people are willing to confront it. Philanthropy can support that but, more importantly, support needs to come from local leadership, leaders who say, "This cannot continue."

AUDIENCE COMMENT: A number of speakers have talked about the transformational power of research and science in changing the policy dialogue. Arguably, one of the most transformational moments in the last few years occurred around new research in adolescent brain development, which had a direct impact on juvenile justice policies.

It is wonderful when we have a champion emerge from the health or physical sciences who will take research directly into the policy environment. But those champions are few. I think we fall short in maintaining an ongoing dialogue between the research community and the advocacy community.

What are some of the models, particularly in child welfare and juvenile justice arenas, where research effectively has shaped new policy initiatives and reframed the debate about how we help all children?

MAGILL: This is a great point about the research community, and particularly the academic community. So much great research never is introduced to the public in a meaningful way. I have been waiting for the academy to discover the people, and you are waiting for philanthropy to discover the research and connect it to the people. Clearly we need to do those together.

Most foundations are not well staffed. They have a tiny bunch of people. We talk about foundations as if everyone is an Annie E. Casey or a Ford or MacArthur. There are nine people who work with me; a couple of those people are not full time, and three of those people do paperwork. So I would throw the question back and ask the academics in this room how foundations can help the academy discover the people? We can create that space. There is no question people will come if we invite them.

AUDIENCE COMMENT: I represent a local organization that does a mix of direct service and policy. We have spent considerable time explaining how policy changes are working on the ground, how they need to be nurtured and how, without direct services work, systems change will not occur. I wonder if you can talk about the relationship between the national community and local community.

VENTRELL: I think it resembles the scientific model. We have a hypothesis, then we have to test it, then we have to review it. I think we get good ideas. I think the right people just have to be at the table and we have to be open to it.

I do not think anybody on the national policy level is averse to hearing, "Here is the flaw in your standards of practice." I think the people who do this work have to have a clinical component. Our model at the NACC has always been to have cases in the office. You must let that research inform your policymaking.

Let me mention a program in California called The California Child Welfare Co-investment Partnership. These folks got together in California and their mission says: "The California Child Welfare Co-investment Partnership is a collaboration of state agencies, foundations and other nonprofit organizations that seek to improve the lives of children and families who are in or at risk of entering the state child welfare system..." These people are getting together at the same table and having this discussion -- county officials, Casey is part of it.

KAPLAN: For the most part, in my experience, government has not been innovative. I think the innovation has to come from the neighborhoods and the communities. Too often, however, the nonprofits are not fueled, and we all know that practice informs innovation. We are very fortunate to have the opportunity to pilot a model, to have it externally evaluated and tested, and then present the innovation to government or to other nonprofits. For us, there has been a real connection between the direct service fueling the model, and the research and evidence piece that positions you to present the findings hope it becomes an innovation.

Philanthropy fuels innovation and communities fuel innovation and we need to bring those together.

BILCHIK: Thank you all - members of the audience and our distinguished panelists - for enabling such a rich and candid conversation today. We look forward to continuing this discussion of philanthropy's role in public policy at our next Forum, to be held in April. We hope to see you then.