



## CIVIC HEALTH AND THE ECONOMY: Making the Connection

2013



**National Conference on Citizenship**  
*Chartered by Congress*

In partnership with:



## Executive Summary

---

Multiple studies over the past several years point to a compelling truth: there is a strong relationship between civic health and a thriving economy. This report attempts to weave together the most interesting studies into a story about how communities become healthier when more people are civically engaged.

Together with our partners, NCoC has embarked on a journey to explore what role civic health can play in boosting the economic performance of our communities. That exploration culminated in two studies. In 2011, we examined the relationship between civic engagement and economic resilience, finding that five measures of civic engagement – attending meetings, helping neighbors, registering to vote, volunteering and voting – help protect communities against unemployment and contribute to overall economic resiliency. The subsequent study – released in 2012 – built upon the first. It found that communities with greater nonprofit density and stronger social cohesion were not hit as hard during the Great Recession.

In June 2013, the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) made the next connection between civic health and employment when they released “Volunteering as a Pathway to Employment.” This report provides substantial evidence establishing a connection between volunteering and finding a job. The report shows that volunteering is associated with an increased likelihood of finding employment for all volunteers regardless of a person’s gender, age, ethnicity, geographic area or the job market conditions.

This report outlines those studies and summarizes a number of others that found:

- Civic engagement can develop skills, confidence, and habits that make individuals employable—and signal desirable qualities to potential employers.
- Participation in civil society is strongly correlated with trust in other people. High levels of trust and social capital, in turn, may facilitate economic transactions and promote innovation in business.
- Civic engagement can encourage people to feel attached to their communities, and create an infrastructure that encourages people to invest, spend and hire.

We hope that you will share the good news about how communities become healthier with family, friends, and colleagues around the country.

## Civic Health and Unemployment: Can Engagement Strengthen the Economy?

---

In 2011, NCoC, in partnership with CIRCLE at Tufts University, Civic Enterprises, Saguaro Seminar, and the National Constitution Center, released a seminal report exploring the relationship between civic engagement and economic resilience. It found that five measures of civic engagement – attending meetings, helping neighbors, registering to vote, volunteering, and voting – appear to help protect communities against unemployment and contribute to overall economic resilience.<sup>1</sup>

## Civic Health and Unemployment II: The Case Builds

---

In 2012, additional research strengthened the relationship between civic engagement and economic resilience. It found that the density and type of nonprofit organizations in a community, as well as a community’s social cohesion, are important predictors of its ability to withstand unemployment in a recession.

- The ten states that scored the best on both nonprofit density and social cohesion had unemployment rates of 6.5 percent in 2010, compared with 10.8 percent unemployment in the lowest-scoring states.
- States with high social cohesion had unemployment rates two percentage points lower than their less connected and trusting counterparts, even when controlling for demographics and economic factors.
- A county with one extra nonprofit per 1,000 people in 2005 would have half a percentage point less unemployment by 2009.
  - The types of organizations that appear to be helpful could be described as:

Produced by:  
National Conference on Citizenship  
(NCoC) in partnership with the Center  
for Information and Research on Civic  
Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)  
at Tufts University, The John S. and  
James L. Knight Foundation, and the  
Corporation for National and Community  
Service (CNCS)

Authors:  
Primary Authors: Peter Levine and Kei  
Kawashima-Ginsberg

Editors: Kristen Cambell, Jeff Coates,  
Kristi Tate, Ben Thrutchley, and  
Ilir Zherka

Special thanks to Dr. Chris Spera,  
Adrienne DiTommaso, and the CNCS  
team for their contributions.



- » Organizations that provide direct, tangible benefits to their members;
  - » Horizontal organizations, characterized by peer-to-peer interactions and collective decision-making;
  - » Groups that meet regularly and whose supporters perceive themselves as genuine members; and,
  - » “Thick” rather than “thin” organizations. In “thick” organizations, people are loyal to the group and are generally willing to do what it decides to do (within reason), whereas “thin” groups pursue a defined agenda their members endorse. In other words, thick groups involve commitment, whereas thin ones are transactional.
- For individuals who held jobs in 2008, the odds of becoming unemployed were cut in half if they lived in a community with many nonprofit organizations rather than in one with a few nonprofits. This is true even if the two communities were otherwise similar.<sup>2</sup>

## Volunteering as a Pathway to Employment

New research from the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), entitled “Volunteering as a Pathway to Employment,” provides compelling empirical evidence establishing an association between volunteering and employment.

- Volunteers have a 27 percent higher likelihood of finding a job after being out of work than non-volunteers.
- Volunteers without a high school diploma have a 51 percent higher likelihood of finding employment than non-volunteers.
- Volunteers living in rural areas have a 55 percent higher likelihood of finding employment than non-volunteers.
- Volunteering is associated with an increased likelihood of finding employment for all volunteers regardless of a person’s gender, age, ethnicity, geographical area, or the job market conditions.<sup>3</sup>

## Further Evidence

In addition to the studies above, there is a growing body of work supporting the argument that civic health and economic vitality are fundamentally interwoven. The following hypotheses, and supporting literature, help explain why these links exist.

### 1. PARTICIPATION IN CIVIL SOCIETY CAN DEVELOP SKILLS, CONFIDENCE, AND HABITS THAT MAKE INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYABLE, AS WELL AS CULTIVATE THE NETWORKS THAT GET PEOPLE JOBS.

- A 2006 study found that the labor-market value of “people skills” has increased rapidly in Britain, Germany, and the United States since 1970. Measures of “people skills” include, for example, preference for work that requires contact with people and a “preference for working for the presumed good of people.” The authors found that levels of sociability among young people predict their acquisition of people skills and also predict wages in adulthood.<sup>4</sup>
- Eighty-one percent of volunteers in national service programs believe their service will improve their chance of finding jobs.<sup>5</sup>
- Among the many important studies linking human capital accumulation to volunteering,<sup>6</sup> one study in particular notes that volunteer work “raises one’s future earning power by providing work experience and providing potentially valuable contacts.”<sup>7</sup>
- Mark Granovetter’s seminal article on networks asserted that people find jobs through contacts, and especially through their “weak ties”—individuals whom they know, but who are not especially important to them.<sup>8</sup>
- A more recent study found that personal and professional ties are the most important avenues to getting a job. Since then, multi-billion dollar online social networks have been created to facilitate weak-tie connections for hiring.<sup>9</sup>



*States with high social cohesion had unemployment rates two percentage points lower than their less connected and trusting counterparts, even when controlling for demographics and economic factors.*

## **2. VOLUNTEERING AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT MAY SIGNAL DESIRABLE QUALITIES TO POTENTIAL EMPLOYERS—PROVIDING A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN HIRING.**

- Volunteering may send a signal to employers about the personal qualities of the volunteer. Signaling theory suggests that while the job applicant knows full well their abilities, the employer only knows what is revealed through the application, interview, or other personal references and observation.<sup>10</sup> Studies suggest that volunteering may send a similar signal to employers that an individual has a certain degree of human and social capital that may or may not be held by other applicants who did not volunteer. It is possible that even if volunteering does not actually confer additional human or social capital, it can provide the volunteer a competitive advantage to the extent that employers identify volunteering with desirable characteristics.
- Reinforcing this theory, a recent nationwide study by Career Builder asked hiring managers and human resource professionals across industries which factors would make them more likely to choose one of two equally qualified candidates. Community involvement was one of the top responses, with 26 percent choosing this as a determining factor.<sup>11</sup> Another study by Deloitte also indicates that skills-based volunteering provides a marketability edge for job-seekers.<sup>12</sup>

## **3. PARTICIPATION IN CIVIL SOCIETY IS STRONGLY CORRELATED WITH TRUST IN OTHER PEOPLE. HIGH LEVELS OF TRUST AND SOCIAL CAPITAL MAY, IN TURN, FACILITATE ECONOMIC TRANSACTIONS AND PROMOTE INNOVATION IN BUSINESS.**

- Most studies find that trusting other people encourages individuals to join groups, and participating in groups builds trust.<sup>13</sup> This is especially the case when individuals spend more time engaged in volunteering activities through an association.<sup>14</sup> In turn, trust is a powerful predictor of economic success because people who trust are more likely to enter contracts and business partnerships, and because confidence in others is a precondition for investing, hiring, and business innovation.<sup>15</sup>
- Social capital promotes business. It increases networking efficiency, reduces transactional costs, and makes for easier coordination within a network. Social capital encourages innovative ideas to become reality, because players in a strong network can share ideas, exchange key information, and connect ideas within the network.<sup>16</sup>
- Furthermore, Richard Florida, who coined the term “creative class,” argues that highly educated and talented people may be drawn to high social capital areas. They contribute to the growth of the local economy and a lower level of unemployment. This is partly because they change the composition of the local workforce and because they make the local economy grow.<sup>17</sup>

## **4. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT CAN PLAY A KEY ROLE IN INFORMAL ECONOMIC EXCHANGE AND INCOME MOBILITY.**

- Most existing literature focuses on economic activities that are conducted through businesses and formal (i.e., recorded) transactions. However, a study in the U.K. found that in impoverished areas a majority of economic transactions related to local work occurs within a social network of family and friends. The study argued that community engagement and economic transactions are intricately tied to one another as, in some areas, over 75 percent of material support to friends and neighbors involved cash transactions. Thus, strong social capital in a local community can keep cash flow in the community active and (informal) businesses alive in times of economic hardship.<sup>18</sup>

- Other studies found monetary transactions with neighbors build and maintain social capital as much as provide individuals with economic gain.<sup>19</sup> Put another way, at least in lower-income communities, strong social capital plays an important role in promoting and maintaining businesses and cash transactions within the local neighborhood.
- A new study demonstrates that civic engagement is a key driver of income mobility, among other important factors such as education, family structure, and the economic layout of metropolitan areas.<sup>20</sup>

## **5. COMMUNITIES AND POLITICAL JURISDICTIONS WITH STRONGER CIVIL SOCIETIES ARE MORE LIKELY TO HAVE GOOD GOVERNMENTS AND TO BENEFIT FROM BETTER INFORMATION FLOW.**

- Active and organized citizens can demand and promote good governance and serve as partners to government in addressing public problems. Thus, states with more civic engagement have much higher-performing public schools, regardless of the states' demographics, spending, and class sizes.<sup>21</sup>
- American cities with stronger civic organizations are better able to make wise but difficult policy decisions.<sup>22</sup>
- In the current economic crisis, governments that benefit from better civic engagement may be able to reduce the scale of unemployment through more efficient and equitable policies.
- Attending meetings, working with neighbors on community problems, volunteering, and receiving newsletters from nonprofit organizations are examples of valuable ways of learning about local issues and opportunities. News media use and discussion are correlated with civic participation, a point first made by de Tocqueville in the 1830s and often noted since. For example, a 2005 study concluded, “Interpersonal communication [is a] driving force for joining groups and organizations... Through more exchange of information, individuals become more aware of current events and issues in their community, and learn more about the thoughts and civic values of those with whom they interact.”<sup>23</sup>
- Granovetter argued that one way in which weak network ties facilitate employment is by efficiently transmitting information.<sup>24</sup> This is further supported by a study of Chicago neighborhoods, which found that local and frequent interactions within neighborhoods spread information about job openings.<sup>25</sup>

## **6. CIVIC ENGAGEMENT CAN ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO FEEL ATTACHED TO THEIR COMMUNITIES AND CREATE AN INFRASTRUCTURE THAT ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO INVEST, SPEND, AND HIRE LOCALLY.**

- The proportion of people who report being attached to their communities predicts economic growth. Liking and caring about where one lives increases the odds that one will invest, spend, and hire there.<sup>26</sup>
- A related hypothesis holds that the strength of local civic infrastructure, such as the availability of civically-committed religious congregations,<sup>27</sup> the availability of local associations, and “third places” (informal venues such as barber shops and bars), boosts attachment and investment in the community. This lowers out-migration.<sup>28</sup> This, in turn, increases civic engagement and local economic investment.
- Robert Sampson's work, *Great American City*, demonstrated that a strong organizational infrastructure boosts a community's capacity for collective civic action and residents' sense of collective efficacy. This can also boost confidence in the economy: “It is the totality of this institutional infrastructure that seems to matter in promoting

civic health and extending to unexpected economic vitality, whether in the form of rebuilding New Orleans or in rehabilitating vacant houses in economically depressed neighborhoods in cities across the country.”<sup>29</sup>

## Conclusion

NCoC and our partners are committed to continuing this journey to further understand the links between our nation’s civic life and our economic vitality. Over the past two years, we have convened a nationwide working group of thought leaders, researchers, practitioners, and partners to guide a deeper exploration of this topic. We have held discussions at events across the country to engage new voices in this dialogue and better understand the implications for this research on communities. We have engaged our nation’s leading policymakers in the topic, inviting new champions into the dialogue. Board of Reserve Governor Sarah Bloom Raskin has reinforced the findings with her remarks at the 2012 National Conference on Citizenship:

---

*I like the research for many reasons, but particularly because it shows us that civic engagement is, potentially, a kind of softening agent – it’s a buffer that keeps unemployment from being much higher than it could be. The way civic engagement does this is through these dual effects: the enhancement of human capital, which you get when you participate in a lot of volunteer and civic minded activities; and the networking component, the ability to actually stay engaged, to meet other people, to be an integral part of the community.*

---

These studies are powerful reminders that when our nation’s citizens are more connected and more engaged, our communities are stronger. We hope this research illuminates the critical roles of social capital and civic health in ensuring economic vitality. We invite others to join us to advance this conversation.

## Endnotes

- 1 National Conference on Citizenship, *Civic Health and Unemployment: Can Engagement Strengthen the Economy?*, Washington, DC, September 2011.
- 2 National Conference on Citizenship, *Civic Health and Unemployment II: The Case Builds*, Washington, DC, September 2012.
- 3 “Volunteering as a Pathway to Employment Report,” Corporation for National and Community Service, <http://www.nationalservice.gov/impact-our-nation/research-and-reports/volunteering-pathway-employment-report>.
- 4 L. Borghans, B. ter Weel, and B. A. Weinberg, *People people: Social capital and the labor-market outcomes of underrepresented groups*, (2006), unpublished manuscript.
- 5 AmeriCorps Exit Survey, 2011-2012
- 6 V. Schram and M. Dunsing, “Influences on Married Women’s Volunteer Work Participation,” *Journal of Consumer Research* 7 (1981): 371-379.
- 7 K. Day and R. Devlin, “The Payoff to Work Without Pay: Volunteer Work as an Investment in Human Capital,” *Canadian Journal of Economics* 31(5) (1998): 1179-1191.
- 8 M. Mueller, “Economic Determinants of Volunteer Work by Women,” *Signs* 1 (1975): 325-338.
- 9 P. Menchik, and B. Weisbrod, “Volunteer Labor Supply,” *Journal of Public Economics* 32 (1987): 159-183.
- 10 M. S. Granovetter, “The Strength of Weak Ties,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6) (1973): 1360-1380.
- 11 T. Petersen, I. Saporta, and M. L. Seidel, “Offering a Job: Meritocracy and Social Networks,” *American Journal of Sociology* 106(3) (2000): 763 -816.
- 12 M. Spence, “Job Market Signaling,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87(3) (1973): 355-374.
- 13 B. L. Connelly, S. T. Certo, R. D. Ireland, and C. R. Reutzel, “Signaling Theory: A Review and Assessment,” *Journal of Management* 37(1) (2011): 39-67.
- 14 “CareerBuilder Study Reveals Surprising Factors that Play a Part in Determining Who Gets Hired,” August 28, 2013, [http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleases-detail.aspx?sd=8%2f28%2f2013&siteid=cbpr&sc\\_cmp1=cb\\_pr778\\_&id=pr778&ed=12%2f31%2f2013](http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleases-detail.aspx?sd=8%2f28%2f2013&siteid=cbpr&sc_cmp1=cb_pr778_&id=pr778&ed=12%2f31%2f2013).
- 15 “2013 Volunteer IMPACT Survey,” Deloitte, [http://www.deloitte.com/view/en\\_US/us/About/Community-Involvement/f0d3264f0b0fb110VgnVCM100000ba42f00aRCRD.htm](http://www.deloitte.com/view/en_US/us/About/Community-Involvement/f0d3264f0b0fb110VgnVCM100000ba42f00aRCRD.htm).
- 16 K. M. Sonderskov, “Does Generalized Social Trust Lead to Associational Membership? Unraveling a Bowl of Well-Tossed Spaghetti,” *European Sociological Review*, (2010): accessed September 12, 2012, doi:10.1093/esr/jcq017
- 17 J. Isham, J. Kolodinsky, and G. Kimberly, “The Effects of Volunteering for Nonprofit Organizations on Social Capital Formation: Evidence from a Statewide Survey,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3) (2006): 367-383.
- 18 F. Fukuyama, *Trust: Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York: Free Press, 1995)
- 19 T. Tura, and V. Harmaakorpi, “Social Capital in Building Regional Innovative Capability,” *Regional Studies* 39(8) (2010): 1111-1125.
- 20 T. Tura and Harmaakorpi, “Social Capital,” 1111-1125.
- 21 R. Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class* (New York: Basic Books, 2002)
- 22 C. Williams, “Fostering Community Engagement and Tackling Undeclared Work: The Case for an Evidence-based ‘Joined-up’ Public Policy Approach,” *Regional Studies* 39(8) (2002): 1145-1155.
- 23 L. Jensen, G. Cornwell, and J. Findeis, “Informal Work in Nonmetropolitan Pennsylvania,” *Rural Sociology* 60 (1995): 90-107.
- 24 M. Nelson, and J. Smith, *Working Hard and Making Do: Surviving in Small Town America* (University of California Press: Los Angeles, 1999)
- 25 David Leonhardt, “In Climbing Income Ladder, Location Matters,” *New York Times*, July 22, 2013, [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/22/business/in-climbing-income-ladder-location-matters.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/22/business/in-climbing-income-ladder-location-matters.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).
- 26 R. D. Putnam, “Community-based Social Capital and Educational Performance,” in *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society*, eds. D. Ravitch and J. P. Viteritti, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001) 58.
- 27 J. M. Berry, K. E. Portney, and K. Thomson, K. *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1993)
- 28 K. Fleming, E. Thorson, and Z. Peng, “Associational Membership as a Source of Social Capital: Its Link to Use of Local Newspaper, Interpersonal Communication, Entertainment Media, and Volunteering,” *Mass Communication & Society* 8(3) (2005): 219-240.
- 29 Granovetter, “The Strength of Weak Ties,” 1360-1380.
- 30 G. Topa, “Social Interactions, Local Spillovers and Unemployment,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 68(2)(235) (2001): 261-295.
- 31 Knight Foundation, *Soul of the Community 2010*. [http://www.soulofthecommunity.org/sites/default/files/SOTC\\_2010\\_Report\\_OVERALL\\_11-12-10\\_mh.pdf](http://www.soulofthecommunity.org/sites/default/files/SOTC_2010_Report_OVERALL_11-12-10_mh.pdf).
- 32 C. M. Tolbert, T. A. Lyson, and M. D. Irwin, “Local Capitalism, Civic Engagement, and Socio-economic Well-being,” *Social Forces* 77(2) (1998): 401-428.
- 33 M. Irwin, T. Blanchard, C. Tolbert, A. Nucci, and T. Lyson, “Why People Stay: The Impact of Community Context on Nonmigration in the USA,” *Population* 59(5) (2004): 567-592.
- 34 Robert J. Sampson, *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012)

# CIVIC HEALTH INDEX

## State and Local Partnerships

NCoC began America's Civic Health Index in 2006 to measure the level of civic engagement and health of our democracy. In 2009, NCoC was incorporated into the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act and directed to expand this civic health assessment in partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service and the U.S. Census Bureau.

NCoC now works with partners in more than 30 communities nationwide to use civic data to lead and inspire a public dialogue about the future of citizenship in America and to drive sustainable civic strategies.

## STATES

### Alabama

University of Alabama  
David Mathews Center  
Auburn University

### Arizona

Center for the Future of Arizona

### California

California Forward  
Center for Civic Education  
Center for Individual and  
Institutional Renewal  
Davenport Institute

### Connecticut

Everyday Democracy  
Secretary of the State of Connecticut

### Florida

Florida Joint Center for Citizenship  
Bob Graham Center for Public Service  
Lou Frey Institute of Politics  
and Government  
John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

### Georgia

GeorgiaForward  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government,  
The University of Georgia  
Georgia Family Connection Partnership

### Illinois

Citizen Advocacy Center  
McCormick Foundation

### Indiana

Center on Congress at Indiana University  
Hoosier State Press  
Association Foundation  
Indiana Bar Foundation  
Indiana Supreme Court  
Indiana University Northwest

### Kentucky

Commonwealth of Kentucky,  
Secretary of State's Office  
Institute for Citizenship  
& Social Responsibility,  
Western Kentucky University  
Kentucky Advocates for Civic Education  
McConnell Center, University of Louisville

### Maryland

Mannakee Circle Group  
Center for Civic Education  
Common Cause-Maryland  
Maryland Civic Literacy Commission

### Massachusetts

Harvard Institute of Politics

### Michigan

Michigan Nonprofit Association  
Michigan Campus Compact  
Michigan Community Service Commission  
Volunteer Centers of Michigan  
Council of Michigan Foundations  
The LEAGUE Michigan

### Minnesota

Center for Democracy and Citizenship

### Missouri

Missouri State University

### New Hampshire

Carsey Institute

### New York

Siena College Research Institute  
New York State Commission on National  
and Community Service

### North Carolina

North Carolina Civic  
Education Consortium  
Center for Civic Education  
NC Center for Voter Education  
Democracy NC  
NC Campus Compact  
Western Carolina University Department of  
Public Policy

### Ohio

Miami University Hamilton Center for  
Civic Engagement

### Oklahoma

University of Central Oklahoma  
Oklahoma Campus Compact

### Pennsylvania

Center for Democratic Deliberation  
National Constitution Center

### Texas

University of Texas at San Antonio  
The Annette Strauss Institute for Civic Life,  
University of Texas at Austin

### Virginia

Center for the Constitution at James  
Madison's Montpelier  
Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

## CITIES

### Chicago

McCormick Foundation

### Miami

Florida Joint Center for Citizenship  
John S. and James L. Knight Foundation  
Miami Foundation

### Seattle

Seattle City Club  
Boeing Company  
Seattle Foundation

### Twin Cities

Center for Democracy and Citizenship  
Citizens League  
John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

## MILLENNIALS CIVIC HEALTH INDEX

### Millennials Civic Health Index

Mobilize.org  
Harvard Institute of Politics  
CIRCLE

## Civic Health Indicators Working Group

---

NCoC would like to thank the following individuals who have contributed in a variety of ways to this body of research.

### **Justin Bibb**

Special Assistant for Education and Economic Development for the County Executive, Cuyahoga County, Ohio

### **Harry Boyte**

Director, Center for Democracy and Citizenship

### **John Bridgeland**

CEO, Civic Enterprises  
Chairman, Board of Advisors, National Conference on Citizenship  
Former Assistant to the President of the United States & Director, Domestic Policy Council & USA Freedom Corps

### **Nelda Brown**

Executive Director, National Service-Learning Partnership at the Academy for Educational Development

### **Kristen Cambell**

Chief Program Officer,  
National Conference on Citizenship

### **Jeff Coates**

Program Manager for Certification Services,  
National Conference on Citizenship

### **Doug Dobson**

Executive Director,  
Florida Joint Center for Citizenship

### **David Eisner**

Former President and CEO,  
National Constitution Center

### **Paula Ellis**

Former Vice President, Strategic Initiatives,  
John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

### **Maya Enista Smith**

Former CEO, Mobilize.org

### **William Galston**

Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution  
Former Deputy Assistant to the President of the United States for Domestic Policy

### **Stephen Goldsmith**

Former Deputy Mayor of New York City  
Daniel Paul Professor of Government,  
Kennedy School of Government at  
Harvard University  
Director, Innovations in American  
Government  
Former Mayor of Indianapolis

### **Robert Grimm, Jr.**

Director of the Center for Philanthropy  
and Nonprofit Leadership,  
University of Maryland

### **Lloyd Johnston**

Research Professor and Distinguished  
Research Scientist at the University of  
Michigan's Institute for Social Research  
Principal Investigator of the Monitoring  
the Future Study

### **Kei Kawashima-Ginsberg**

Deputy Director, Center for Information and  
Research on Civic Learning and Engage-  
ment (CIRCLE) at the Jonathan M. Tisch  
College of Citizenship and Public Service at  
Tufts University

### **Peter Levine**

Director, Center for Information and  
Research on Civic Learning and  
Engagement (CIRCLE) at the Jonathan M.  
Tisch College of Citizenship and Public  
Service at Tufts University

### **Chaeyoon Lim**

Assistant Professor of Sociology,  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

### **Mark Hugo Lopez**

Director, Hispanic Research, Pew Research  
Center  
Research Professor, University of  
Maryland's School of Public Affairs

### **Sean Parker**

Co-Founder and Chairman of Causes on  
Facebook/MySpace  
Founding President of Facebook

### **Kenneth Prewitt**

Former Director of the United States  
Census Bureau  
Carnegie Professor of Public Affairs and  
the Vice-President for Global Centers at  
Columbia University

### **Robert Putnam**

Peter and Isabel Malkin Professor of Public  
Policy, Kennedy School of Government at  
Harvard University  
Founder, Saguario Seminar  
Author of *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and  
Revival of American Community*

### **Thomas Sander**

Executive Director, the Saguario Seminar,  
Harvard University

### **David B. Smith**

Chief of Programs and Strategy,  
National Center for Service and  
Innovative Leadership  
Founder, Mobilize.org

### **Heather Smith**

Executive Director, Rock the Vote

### **Max Stier**

Executive Director,  
Partnership for Public Service

### **Michael Stout**

Associate Professor of Sociology,  
Missouri State University

### **Kristi Tate**

Director of Community Strategies,  
National Conference on Citizenship

### **Michael Weiser**

Chairman,  
National Conference on Citizenship

### **Jonathan Zaff**

Vice President for Research,  
America's Promise Alliance

### **Iliir Zherka**

Executive Director, National Conference  
on Citizenship





In partnership with:

---



**National Conference on Citizenship**  
*Chartered by Congress*

