

Federal Volunteerism Policy and the States: An Analysis of Citizen Corps

By Jeffrey L. Brudney and Beth Gazley

In his 2002 State of the Union message, President George W. Bush announced the creation of an umbrella citizen service initiative, the USA Freedom Corps, intended to dramatically increase volunteerism. Under this initiative, the Citizen Corps has the central responsibility for mobilizing local volunteers in emergency preparedness and response. Interviews of state officials who will implement Citizen Corps suggest a framework for understanding the success of federal volunteerism initiatives devolved to the state and local levels. Five factors appear important to implementation success: goal clarity, resource availability, promotional activity, management capacity, and the strength of the implementation network.

Volunteer Initiatives of the Bush Administration

The tragic events of September 11, 2001 revealed a need to devote more resources to building the federal, state and local emergency management infrastructure. The events and their aftermath also underscored the willingness of citizens to supplement government emergency preparedness efforts. Hoping to institutionalize the wave of civic involvement that September 11 unleashed, on January 29, 2002 President Bush launched the USA Freedom Corps, an ambitious initiative unprecedented in its potential impact on public volunteerism. Previous presidents have also sought to promote both public policy and volunteerism with new service programs. Prior to September 11, President Bush focused initially on integrating faith-based organizations into the delivery of social services. While faith-based volunteer efforts continue to receive federal attention, the trauma of September 11 has shifted the focus and, to some extent, the priorities of volunteerism policies toward terrorism prevention and response.

President Bush established the USA Freedom Corps as an umbrella organization intended to “inspire and enable all Americans to find ways to serve their community, their country, or the world.”¹ An interagency initiative with the mission of “recruiting, mobilizing and encouraging” citizen service, the USA Freedom Corps aims to provide opportunities for volunteers, facilitate public access to information about volunteer opportunities, and reward and recognize public service.² In his 2002 State of the Union address, the president appealed to all Americans to commit at least two years of their lives — the equivalent of 4,000 hours — to volunteer service.

Most existing national service programs fall under the Freedom Corps umbrella, and new programs have

been created as well. The goal is to have a cabinet-level “Freedom Corps Council” perform a coordinating role over government volunteer activities, analogous to the role played by the National Security Council in defense. The Freedom Corps Council follows the model of President Nixon’s earlier “Domestic Council” by comprising the heads of the agencies responsible for specific national service programs (see Table A for a full list).

Table B summarizes the major components of the USA Freedom Corps. The Citizen Corps program is designed to promote “opportunities for people across the country to participate in a range of measures to make their families, homes and communities safer from the threats of terrorism, crime and disasters of all kinds,” and to “bring together a community’s first responders, firefighters, emergency health care providers, law enforcement and emergency managers with its volunteer resources.”³ The Federal Emergency Management Agency is charged with responsibility for coordinating Citizen Corps. Citizen Corps programs include a new Medical Reserve Corps, Volunteers in Police Service Program and Operation TIPS (Terrorist Information and Prevention System), and the expansion of existing complementary public service programs such as the Neighborhood Watch program and the Community Emergency Response Team. At the local level, existing networks of voluntary organizations active in disaster (“VOADs”) have been encouraged to join with government agencies to coordinate activities through “Citizen Corps Councils.” To support these programs, President Bush requested more than \$1.2 billion in continuing and new funding for FY 2003. At its first anniversary in January 2003, 304 state and local Citizens Corps Councils had been registered.

Table A: Agencies Involved in Implementing the USA Freedom Corps

<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
Federal Emergency Management Agency	State emergency management agency	Local government
Corporation for National and Community Service	State service commission	Volunteer resource centers
Department of Justice	Governor's Office on Volunteerism	Voluntary organizations active in disaster ("VOADs"): Red Cross, Salvation Army, etc.
Peace Corps	Other agencies that involve volunteers: Education, Health, etc.	Other public and nonprofit agencies involving volunteers
Department of Health and Human Services	Other state offices or task forces involved in homeland security: public safety, national guard, etc.	Citizen groups and task forces
Department of Education		
Department of Commerce		
Department of Veterans Affairs		
Department of State		
White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives		
U.S. Agency for International Development		

Source: Jeffrey L. Brudney and Beth Gazley.

The role envisioned for the states in these federal volunteer initiatives is to promote, support and coordinate volunteer activities at the local level — “to encourage every community in the state to participate in Citizen Corps.”⁴ The governor is to appoint a coordinator for Citizen Corps. Most governors have selected the director of the state emergency management office; in seven states the governor has appointed the director of the state (volunteer) service commission.

Little research has considered the efficacy of such federal promotional and coordination activities as a policy instrument for stimulating and sustaining volunteerism;⁵ one recent book on the “tools” of government ignores volunteerism altogether.⁶ Given the increased use of volunteers by governments over the past several decades, and apparent plans to rely on them still more, we believe volunteerism policy commands greater attention.

Survey of State Officials

P.C. Bishop and A.J. Jones Jr. note, “It is possible to assess the success of a policy’s implementation even as the earliest steps toward actualization are being made. This is a prospective attitude.”⁷ To examine the role of the states in Citizen Corps and to obtain an early assessment of the prospects of this volunteer initiative from the front lines, in Summer 2002 we conducted two sets of semi-structured telephone interviews. Our first set of interviews was with state emergency management officials. At the federal level, FEMA bears responsibility for the coordination of Citizen Corps; at the state level, state appointed emergency management officials will either direct or help to coordinate local Citizen Corps activities. We obtained interviews with state emergency management officials in 30 states: 16 were agency directors, executive directors, or deputy directors; eight were emergency management administrators; and six were designated by the state governor as the Citizen Corps point of contact.⁸ The confidential interviews

asked a series of questions designed to elicit a frank appraisal of the state officials’ understanding of the role of their agency, and their opinion on the progress, opportunities, concerns, potential barriers and resource needs as the implementation of Citizen Corps unfolded.⁹ For confirmatory purposes only (data not included), we also interviewed the directors of six of the 10 FEMA regional offices.

Using the same survey protocol, we also interviewed the directors of the state service commissions. These officials are responsible for oversight of federal volunteer service programs such as AmeriCorps; they are also normally charged with considerable responsibilities for promotion and/or coordination of volunteerism in their states. In seven states, this official is also responsible for Citizen Corps; we interviewed all seven of these individuals.¹⁰ In the other states, where they were in a position to bring additional expertise, connections and resources to the Citizen Corps program, we sought to assess the extent to which these officials were involved in implementing the new volunteerism initiatives. Since the Corporation for National and Community Service, the parent agency for the state service commissions, had been given much of the early promotional responsibility for the USA Freedom Corps at the federal level, we wanted to see how that involvement was reflected at the state level. We secured interviews with 27 state service commission directors.¹¹ Between the two samples, we obtained information regarding the implementation of Citizen Corps in 44 states.

Implementation of Citizen Corps in the States

Each section below describes a key concept related to successful implementation of government volunteer programs, based on the literatures in policy implementation and volunteer management. Our survey results are reported in relation to these concepts.

VOLUNTEERISM

Table B: USA Freedom Corps/Citizen Corps Programs and Goals

<i>Name of program</i>	<i>Parent agency</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Current number of participants</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>President's FY 2003 funding request (in millions)</i>
Citizen Corps Councils	FEMA	Provides tools and funding to local communities to coordinate emergency planning and response.	304 councils as of Jan. 2003	Every community in America	\$144
Community Emergency Response Teams	FEMA	Organizes citizen community emergency planning and response activities.	~200,000	Triple by 2004 to 600,000	\$61
Medical Reserve Corps	HHS	Utilizes retired health care professionals to serve as supplemental emergency responders.	New	10-city pilot program in 2002	\$10
Volunteers in Police Service	DOJ	Adds voluntary citizen support to police activities.	New	Unknown	\$3
Operation TIPS: Terrorism Information and Prevention System	DOJ	Provides terrorism awareness and reporting tools to public workers.	New	1,000,000 volunteers in 10 cities	\$8
Neighborhood Watch	DOJ	Adds terrorism prevention element to neighborhood safety programs.	Unknown	Double by 2004	\$6
Peace Corps	Autonomous agency	Overseas community-building program.	7,000	15,000	\$320
AmeriCorps	CNCS	Stipended direct service volunteers in variety of roles, including public safety.	50,000	75,000	\$403
Senior Corps	CNCS	Volunteer opportunities for seniors.	500,000	600,000	\$268
Learn and Serve America	CNCS	Youth service learning.	1,477,350	1,500,000	\$43

Source: President's budget, FEMA, CNCS, Peace Corps and Department of Justice press offices and Web sites.
Key:
 FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency.
 HHS - U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
 DOJ - U.S. Department of Justice.
 CNCS - Corporation for National and Community Service.

Goal Clarity

Mazmanian and Sabatier have suggested the value in clear “marching orders” for those charged with implementing a policy. However, the majority of emergency management respondents (57 percent or 17 state officials) indicated that their role in implementing Citizen Corps was not clearly defined, and that they required more direction from the federal government. One-quarter (seven officials) indicated they were doing little or nothing in regard to Citizen Corps or were unsure of what was being asked of them. Although CNCS had emphasized that the state commissions need to be involved, one-third (nine officials) were unclear regarding their role in supporting Citizen Corps implementation. A further one-third of the sample planned to assist emergency management officials in developing Citizen Corps or were already part of a statewide task force. Three more respondents would assist if federal funds were made available, while the remaining four expected no role in Citizen Corps, as it was strictly an emergency management program. While some of these results may reflect no more than respondents’ ambivalence about a program that is not yet fully funded, they also illustrate confusion regarding the state role in Citizen Corps implementation — confusion that will only serve to hinder local efforts. Goggin *et. al.* note

that what is accomplished when a federal message is sent depends on how positively and clearly the message is received at the state and local levels.

Funding

Implementation studies have underscored the pre-eminence of funding in policy success.¹² Here, too, state emergency management respondents expressed great concern over the adequacy of funding, with 63 percent (19) identifying this criterion as a major challenge to successful implementation of the new federal volunteer initiatives. More than any other factor, state service commission directors considered the adequacy of funding instrumental to program success. A few emergency management officials told us that they were tapping into already stretched state budgets to begin planning and implementing these programs, but that federal funding was required to move forward. Some expressed concern that Citizen Corps was another “unfunded mandate” of the federal government.

Respondents in both samples remarked that funding alone does not guarantee program success, an observation that implementation literature supports. Agencies are likely to place highest value on funding that builds program infrastructure.¹³ Survey comments reflected concerns about three aspects of funding efficacy:

- *Length of funding commitment and adequacy of funds.* State and local programs that depend on federal demonstration grant funding will require a willing state legislature and/or private grants to continue USA Freedom Corps initiatives over time. Yet, respondents told us that their state legislatures would be hard-pressed to fund an expansion in volunteer programs given current demands on the state treasury. The alternative, private funding, is highly competitive and requires agency heads with a talent for promotion and fundraising and a commitment to building trust and partnerships with private stakeholders.
- *Flexibility in funding purpose.* According to the officials interviewed, federal restrictions prohibit states from using one source of federal funds to match another, so that states or local governments cannot match Citizen Corps grants to AmeriCorps. In addition, a sometime criticism of certain federal volunteer programs has been their emphasis on direct subsidies to volunteers, even while it is difficult for agencies to secure the additional funds needed to *manage* those volunteers.

Promotional Activities

Eight emergency management officials (27 percent) and two state commission directors (7 percent) stated that promotion or marketing of President Bush's volunteer initiatives would be a major challenge. Underlying federal volunteerism policy is the presumption that messages about the value of civic engagement will reach potential volunteers. The strongest predictor of volunteer activity continues to be whether citizens were *asked* to give their time.¹⁴ Thus, the president's frequent public appeals to service, the placement of public service messages, and the creation of user-friendly Web sites and toll-free telephone numbers under the USA Freedom Corps initiative all help to reach potential volunteers.

Yet, while they are valuable in promoting the need for volunteers, such general calls for citizen "help" may not yield volunteers with the qualifications necessary to participate in highly complex service and emergency management positions encompassed by some Citizen Corps programs, such as the Medical Reserve Corps and Community Emergency Response Teams. Television images of confused and sometimes frustrated volunteers turned away from the Twin Towers demolition site in the wake of September 11 illustrate the dilemma. Leading texts in volunteer administration caution that these positions require a targeted recruitment strategy to net volunteers with specialized training.¹⁵ "Layering" a general call to

volunteerism on top of very specific homeland security needs is likely to confound the message.

Capacity: Volunteer Management, Recruitment and Retention

Experts have suggested that federal volunteerism policy is prone to some recurring limitations, due largely to misplaced assumptions about what volunteerism can accomplish and what local agencies can accommodate.¹⁶ Particular concerns center on the availability of volunteers and the over-emphasis on volunteer recruitment without sufficient attention to management. Regarding the first issue, one state emergency management official was apprehensive that "most of the people who want to volunteer in the long run are already there." Indeed, despite ongoing attempts at the highest reaches of government to inspire citizens to donate their time, overall levels of volunteerism have remained remarkably steady over the past two decades.¹⁷ Non-volunteers may be more difficult than expected to mobilize in Citizen Corps.

Furthermore, recruiting volunteers is just the beginning: Successful volunteer programs also require an infrastructure and a set of management tools to place the right volunteers in the right positions (job design), involve them effectively (training, supervision) and retain them (recognition, evaluation).¹⁸ As Don Kettl has pointed out, the key to managing indirect government is strong and sustained capacity.¹⁹ Unless a call for more volunteers is accompanied by the appropriate means and resources for recruitment, placement, supervision and evaluation, program effectiveness is greatly compromised. Susan Ellis described the launching of the USA Freedom Corps as a "surprise announcement" based on a "flawed premise" that organizations were ready or willing to accept more volunteers: "The problem ... is never recruiting volunteers, but rather ... support."²⁰

The emergency management officials interviewed anticipated overwhelmingly that the past experience of their agency with volunteers would be helpful to their new responsibilities under Citizen Corps. However, some state officials also questioned whether an emergency management agency is the appropriate institutional home for an ambitious, rather complex volunteer program such as Citizen Corps. Over half the emergency management offices in the sample (16 or 53 percent) described conditions of transition, turmoil or growth, as their offices attempted to cope with a much larger agenda and greater public prominence, scrutiny and visibility than could have been imagined in a pre-September 11 world. One respondent invited us to "ask states where these vol-

VOLUNTEERISM

unteer initiatives fit in priority to the other terrorism priorities.” Another was more direct: “We are a disaster management agency, not a volunteer management agency.”

Implementation Network

Implementation networks describe the system of public and private organizations with a common interest in, or responsibility for, implementing a public policy.²¹ The large number of agencies involved in implementing the USA Freedom Corps, as shown in Table B, illustrates the complexity of this network. The Citizen Corps network alone encompasses several federal agencies, at least one state agency, and a loose array of local public agencies, VOADs, and other service providers.

The strength of the USA Freedom Corps network may be judged in part based on the amount of attention paid to communication and coordination among the White House, its “volunteerism” agencies, the nonprofit sector, and the various state and local agencies involved in implementing volunteer policy. The “front-lines” seem particularly vulnerable to common network problems of coordination and communication. Approximately one-fourth of both samples felt that the greatest challenge facing the new federal volunteerism policies was gaining support at the local level. One state service commission director said that collaboration would be difficult between local government officials and volunteer groups because “government officials do not feel comfortable sharing public safety data.”

Our survey established that in some states, state-wide coordinating bodies were already in place to implement Citizen Corps, but in others communication was absent between even those agencies most centrally involved. Several state service commission respondents reported that they had called to offer help to the state agency with lead responsibility for Citizen Corps, but had received no indication of interest in collaborating. When asked to rate their state in terms of its overall preparation for Citizen Corps, respondents who gave their states lower grades pointed most often to factors related to poor or underdeveloped network relationships — the sense that these states were behind in organizing, coordinating or staffing interagency implementing systems. By contrast, those state officials who awarded their states higher grades indicated by a large margin that progress was due to having the right players in place, and having invested in interorganizational relationships.

Waugh and Sylves describe the emergency management system as a “bottom-up” network of first responder and related programs dependent on local

arrangements and collaborations.²² Federal and, to some extent, state officials lack direct authority over many of the actors involved in emergency preparedness, mitigation and response. These local networks thrive under conditions of commitment and cooperation rather than hierarchical, command-and-control approaches. Waugh and Sylves foresee the danger that top-down volunteer efforts might inadvertently weaken existing local emergency response partnerships by the imposition of new authorities or distortion of current funding streams. For example, despite a commitment of \$3.5 billion to first responder programs under the Office of Homeland Security and FEMA, President Bush deleted \$100 million from his FY 2003 budget request for the existing Fire Investment and Response Enhancement program.²³ “The key question to implementing this,” one state official told us, “is has the administration recognized existing entities ... instead of creating new programs?”

The State Role in the Implementation Network

In volunteerism policy, states are sometime promoters of volunteerism, creators of part of the infrastructure on which implementation depends, recipients and distributors of federal volunteerism funds. Here, FEMA intends Citizen Corps to be “primarily a local government initiative,” with the states taking a minor, secondary role as supporters, promoters and advocates.²⁴ Federal promotional messages have largely been directed at individuals and localities rather than the states. States are overlooked but important actors in federal policy implementation since they are in the best position to determine and ameliorate gaps in local service provision.²⁵ Without stronger federal promotion of the state role, we expect the extent of state involvement in Citizen Corps, resting on pre-existing relationships, to vary significantly.

Conclusion

This study analyzed the views of high-level state officials charged with implementing Citizen Corps, a new federal program that utilizes state and local resources to mobilize volunteers in emergency and disaster preparedness, mitigation and response. Our interviews with state officials suggest that five factors stand out as crucial to implementation. Together they constitute a framework for assessing the prospects for success of federal volunteerism policy in the states:

- The clarity of goals underlying the volunteer program;
- The length, adequacy and flexibility of the funding commitment;
- Promotional activities on behalf of the program;

- Capacity, or attention to volunteer management, recruitment and retention;
- The strength of the implementation network.

As some respondents reminded us, it is early in the life of Citizen Corps and its parent, the USA Freedom Corps. The most direct and observable results of these national volunteerism policies, such as citizens' immediate response to the president's appeals for volunteers, can be easily measured, but do not capture what experts consider more enduring indicators of the effectiveness of volunteerism policy: ongoing mobilization of volunteers sufficient to the tasks at hand; placement of volunteers in positions for which they possess requisite background and training; satisfaction and retention of volunteers; and the achievement of intended program outcomes. These results await the test of time. Hopefully, the predictive analysis that we have undertaken here can help to inform continued implementation of federal volunteerism policy in the states.

Notes

¹ Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Citizen Corps: A Guide for Local Officials*, 3.

² Executive Order 13254.

³ Federal Emergency Management Agency, 7.

⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency, 20.

⁵ J.L. Brudney, *Fostering Volunteer Programs in the Public Sector* and "The Perils of Practice."

⁶ L.M. Salamon, *The Tools of Government*.

⁷ P.J. Bishop and A.J. Jones Jr., "Implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990," 121.

⁸ Participating states were: Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin. All state officials were contacted by phone a minimum of four times. Two state officials declined to be interviewed; ongoing emergency needs, such as fire-fighting or flood control, precluded some interviews.

⁹ The interview schedule was designed to elicit discussion. The interviews ranged from 15 to 45 minutes; the average length was 25 minutes. Aldo Davila assisted the authors with the interviews. The University of Georgia Institutional Review Board approved the survey.

¹⁰ These states are California, Indiana, Michigan, Mississippi, North Carolina, Washington and Washington DC.

¹¹ Participating states were Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Vermont, Virginia and West Virginia.

¹² D.A. Mazmanian and P.A. Sabatier, *Implementation and Public Policy*; L.J. O'Toole, "Policy Recommendations

for Multi-actor Implementation"; M.L. Goggin *et. al.*, *Implementation Theory and Practice*.

¹³ O'Toole; Goggin *et. al.*

¹⁴ Independent Sector, *Giving and Volunteering in the United States*.

¹⁵ S.J. Ellis, "The Wrong Way to Encourage Volunteerism"; S. McCurley and R. Lynch, *Volunteer Management*.

¹⁶ Ellis; B. O'Connell, "What Voluntary Activity Can and Cannot Do for America."

¹⁷ Independent Sector.

¹⁸ Ellis, *From the Top Down*; McCurley and Lynch; Brudney, 1990.

¹⁹ Salamon.

²⁰ Ellis, "The Wrong Way to Encourage Volunteerism."

²¹ K.G. Provan and H.B. Milward, "Institutional-Level Norms and Organizational Involvement in a Service-Implementation Network."

²² W.L. Waugh Jr. and R.T. Sylves, "Organizing the War on Terrorism."

²³ S. Somers, "First Responder Funding Suffers Setback."

²⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency, 20.

²⁵ Goggin *et. al.*

References

Bishop, P.C., and A.J. Jones Jr. "Implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990: Assessing the Variables of Success." *Public Administration Review* 53, no. 2 (1993): 121-128.

Brudney, J. L. *Fostering Volunteer Programs in the Public Sector*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1990.

Brudney, J. L. "The Perils of Practice: Reaching the Summit." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 9, no. 4 (1999): 385-398.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Citizen Corps: A Guide for Local Officials*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2002.

Ellis, S. J. "The Wrong Way to Encourage Volunteerism." *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, (February 21, 2002).

Ellis, S. J. *From the Top Down: The Executive Role in Volunteer Program Success*. Philadelphia: Energize, 1996.

George W. Bush, "Establishing the USA Freedom Corps," Executive Order 13254, January 29, 2002.

Goggin, M.L., A.O. Bowman, J.P. Lester, and L.J. O'Toole. *Implementation Theory and Practice: Toward a Third Generation*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1990.

Independent Sector. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001*. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 2001.

Mazmanian, D.A. and P.A. Sabatier. *Implementation and Public Policy*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989.

McCurley, S. and R. Lynch. *Volunteer Management*. Downers Grove, IL: Heritage Arts, 1996.

Milward, H.B. "Interorganizational Policy Systems and Research on Public Organizations." *Administration and Society* 13, no. 4 (1982): 457-478.

O'Connell, B. "What Voluntary Activity Can and Cannot Do for America." *Public Administration Review*, 49, no. 5 (1989): 486-491.

VOLUNTEERISM

O'Toole, L.J. "Policy Recommendations for Multi-actor Implementation: An Assessment of the Field." *Journal of Public Policy* 6 (1986): 181-210.

Provan, K.G. and H.B. Milward. "A Preliminary Theory of Interorganizational Network Effectiveness: A comparative Study of Four Community Mental Health Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40 (1995): 1-33.

Provan, K.G. and H.B. Milward. "Institutional-Level Norms and Organizational Involvement in a Service-Implementation Network." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 1, no. 4 (1991): 391-417.

Salamon, L.M. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Somers, S. "First Responder Funding Suffers Setback."

PA Times (May 2002): 1-2.

Waugh, W.L. Jr., and R.T. Sylves. "Organizing the War on Terrorism." *Public Administration Review* 62 (Special Issue, 2002): 81-89.

About the Authors

Jeffrey L. Brudney, Ph.D., is professor of public administration and co-director of the Institute for Nonprofit Organizations at the University of Georgia. He has written extensively on volunteerism, service delivery and public management. **Beth Gazley**, MPA, is a doctoral candidate at the University of Georgia's School of Public and International Affairs. Her research interests include public policy, volunteerism and nonprofit-government relations.